THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. IV.—(LIV).—JANUARY, 1916.—No. 1.

ENGLISH CATHOLIC BENEFIT CLUBS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

THE Old English Guilds or Gilds (for there appears no real reason for the intrusive *u*) were voluntary societies or fraternities, established for mutual help and comfort in the various exigencies of life. They sprang up all over Christian Europe in the Middle Ages. They embraced a wide field of sympathies, being formed for relief in cases of old age, infirmity, sickness, penury (when not the result of misconduct), wrongful imprisonment, as well as losses by fire, water, shipwreck, or sword.

So far they were benefit clubs. But they were more, inasmuch as they always had a religious basis, being placed under the patronage and protection of the Holy Trinity or of some saint, and enforcing attendance at special church services on the members of each gild. Further, the mutual help and comfort they afforded embraced the spiritual side of life, and included mutual prayers for both the living and the dead. Still more, especially did the gilds make much of the dead; carefully conducting the burial of members with great solemnity, obliging the brethren and sisters to attend, and making provision for the continual offering of Masses, both for the welfare of the living and the peaceful and happy repose of the dead.

Gild is derived from an Anglo-Saxon word meaning "to pay"; and signified that each member contributed something toward the common funds of the fraternity, receiving in return certain advantages and privileges. The name is but little removed from the Anglo-Saxon term implying a "collection". The plain-spoken old society lady, who briefly described the

principles of her own communion as "a shilling a quarter, a penny a week, and 'justification by faith'", went more to the heart of the enduring principles of an association than her hearers conceived. But there was in olden times a directness about the form of the collection which is more in accordance with the bluntness of unsophisticated men than the modern rather clumsy attempts to euphemize over the naked fact. In medieval days the art of sugar-coating the pill had not yet been discovered; consequently these fraternities were plainly and frankly called gilds from the Anglo-Saxon *gildan*, "to pay".

Gilds were not unknown among the ancients. They existed in classical days. Despite what Virgil says about oats, the Roman soldiery had for many years no better food than gruel made from oatmeal, and sharpened for the appetite by a little vinegar. The vinegar was an addition suggested by Numa Pompilius, who not only improved the very rude ideas which previously prevailed with regard to making bread, but himself turned baker—sending his loaves to the ovens which he had erected, and raising the bakers to the dignity of a gild, which was placed under the protection of the goddess Fornax; and the vocation of baker became hereditary in a family, so that the son was compelled to follow his father's calling.

There is, moreover, in many details of their observances a close analogy between the gilds of ancient pagan Rome and the Christian gilds of medieval times, a similarity so striking as to form almost an identity. For instance, the funeral chapel on the Appian Way, with its arrangements for memorial feasts, and its liveries for the gild brethren, presents an analogy with the medieval gild that is too close to be accidental. It is singular how strikingly at times this parallelism stands out. Compare the two following ordinances — the one, that of a pagan gild of classical times; the other, belonging to a Christian gild of the Middle Ages.

ORDINANCE OF THE GILD OF DIANA AND ANTINOUS, AT LANUVIUM, A. D. 133.

If any member die beyond the twentieth milestone from the town, and his death be fully reported, three members chosen from our body shall proceed to the place to take charge of his funeral, and shall render a true account, etc. But if the death take place beyond the

twentieth milestone, then those undertaking the funeral shall be reimbursed.

ORDINANCE OF THE HOLY TRINITY AND ST. LEONARD GILD, AT LANCASTER, A. D. 1377.

If any of the Gild dies outside the town of Lancaster, within a space of twenty miles, twelve Brethren shall wend and seek the body, at the cost of the Gild. And if the Brother, so dying, wished to be buried where he died, the said twelve shall see that he has fitting burial there, at the cost of the Gild.

Change Diana and Antinous into Christian saints, change the objects of worship, increase the charitable ordinances of the gild, and what do we find? That the fundamental social principles underlying these institutions have changed but little during the vicissitudes and advances of the twelve hundred years which have elapsed. The payment of the fixed contribution, the endowment, the obsequies, the help given to the less fortunate and poorer brethren, the rules of discipline, the periodical feasts, the gild hall, and the dedication, alike occur in both Roman and medieval forms. "The persistency of these more homely social institutions, through long periods of external historic change, is one of the most interesting facts that meet the student of sociology. Whatever be the explanation of the parallelism we are now noticing—whether it be a case of similar causes producing similar effects, or whether there be in it a curious example of more direct historic descent—it is certain that the prevalence of gilds, or at any rate we may say of institutions closely resembling them, is almost coextensive with the beginning of civilization, both ancient and modern."

It is difficult to assign a fixed date to the origin of gilds in England. They undoubtedly were of ancient birth. Even in the old Roman towns of England there were institutions of a character somewhat similar to the gilds of Saxon and Norman times. They were the "collegia opificum" (colleges of workmen), possessing their own property, their gild-house, president, and governing body. The richer members helped the poorer brethren; and, on certain days, the whole fraternity visited the common sepulchre of the brethren and decked with flowers the tombs of their departed confrères.

Did the Saxons, after their settlement in England, found their gilds on the model of these Roman *collegia?* It is impossible to say. There is a resemblance between them, but the origin of the medieval gilds of England is, in all probability, not to be sought in pagan institutions. They were first formed, doubtless, by Christians, for mutual support and encouragement in matters spiritual as well as temporal, and for the mutual promotion of well-being both in this world and the next. Weight is given to this theory by the fact that the earliest gilds in England were religious gilds. A copy of the rules of one of these gilds is extant. Orcy, a friend of King Canute, founded the Gild of "God and St. Peter", at Abbotsbury, in Dorset. The rules of this gild prompt a suspicion that our modern benefit societies (e. g. the Ancient Order of Foresters, and the Ancient Order of Druids, etc.) were first suggested by these old gilds, mutual help and charity being a basis of both, but with this difference: that with the gilds there also was always a religious foundation.

Here follow some of the rules in the gild ordinance of Orcy's Gild, which he founded as "a lasting commemoration of himself and his consort. Let him that would set it aside answer it to God in the Great Day of Judgment!" Covenants which Orcy and the gildsmen ordained "to the honor of God, the worship of St. Peter, and the hele of their own souls":

Three days before St. Peter's Mass, from each gild-brother one penny or one pennyworth of wax,—look which the minister most needeth; and on the Mass-eve, from every two gild-brothers one bread-loaf, well sifted and well raised, toward our common-alms; and five weeks before Peter's-Mass, let each gild-brother contribute one "gild-sester" full of clean wheat, and let this be paid within three days, or forfeit of the entrance, which is three "sesters" of wheat.

If one brother misgreet another within the Gild in hostile temper, let him atone for it to all the fellowship with the amount of his entrance, and after that to him whom he misgreeted as they two may arrange; and if he will not bend to compensation, let him lose our fellowship and every other advantage of the Gild.

If a brother died, contributions were levied for his "soul's hele"; and if anyone was sick and felt that he was about to die, he was conducted to the place where he desired to go.

The steward of the gild was directed to gather as many of the brethren as possible to attend the funeral, to bear the corpse to the minister, and to pray for the soul. "It is rightly ordained a gildship if we do this, and well fitting it is both toward God and man; for we know not which of us shall first depart."

Now, we have faith through God's assistance that the aforesaid ordinance, if we rightly maintain it, shall be to the benefit of us all. Let us earnestly from the bottom of our hearts beseech Almighty God to have mercy upon us, and also His holy Apostle (St. Peter) to make intercession for us, and take our way unto eternal rest, because for His sake we gathered this gild together.

This ordinance clearly sets forth that religion and charity were the chief objects for which this gild was founded; and the rule for preventing quarreling or "misgreeting" was admirably conceived.

The story of the gilds is not only a fascinatingly interesting study, but also a subject of historical importance, because of the light they shed upon the civil and social life of earlier times, both in England and on the European Continent. This is especially so of the great city gilds. Until the end of the eighteenth century the trade and industry of Western Europe remained largely under the control of the gilds, which proved themselves an organ of social progress—that progress which distinguishes the West from the East—and has given them an important and honored place in the pages of the past. Starting as voluntary associations, in time they acquired strength enough to control even the State, while they remained at the same time flexible enough to be constantly remoulded by the free forces of change.

It is interesting to note that the origin of the present-day system of a mayor and corporation, in England, can be traced back to the ancient "frith" or peace-gild of the Saxon times. In those early days the inhabitants of a town, who formed the "communitas", were all members of the "frith", and were pledged to each other for the maintenance of the public peace. Thus a corporation became formed. Men engaged in any particular industry united themselves into a company or gild, with the object of protecting that industry and of obtaining a

monopoly for themselves. They would not permit anyone who was not a freeman of their gild to practise their trade. They were severe Protectionists.

In most towns there would be several of these gilds, each watching over the interests of its own special industry. In time these gilds united into one great body, "convivium conjuratum", which called itself the gild-merchant of the town, and discharged all the duties which we now expect of town councils and corporation; and the old gild law became the basis of modern borough laws. Thus do the mayors and corporations of to-day derive their descent from the old gilds of a thousand years ago.

But many of the later gilds were neither merchant nor craft gilds; rather they were coöperative charities, often founded originally by parochial magnates, but developed on coöperative lines by the parishioners where the parochial system was strong enough to displace the magnate's influence.

It was in consequence of their first foundation as "chantries" that the parish gilds were swept away with the other chantries. A chantry is a foundation for the maintenance of one or more priests, to offer up prayers for the soul of the founder, his family and ancestors, and usually of all Christian souls. This was the motive of the founders of the majority of chantries of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But the two thousand chantries founded in England between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries were not all of this exclusively personal kind. Many included objects of general utility, which under the name of a chantry could be founded and endowed in a legal way, evading many legal difficulties. Chantries began to be founded late in the thirteenth century, and they continued to be founded up to the very eve of their general suppression and destruction. That chantries encouraged and maintained prayers for the dead was one of the main arguments advanced at their spoliation. That the gilds perpetuated prayers for the souls of their deceased brethren was also made the pretext for their most unjustifiable suppression.

There are few more interesting subjects for students of the religious and social aspects of the Middle Ages than a study of the medieval gilds. As the mist of oblivion is being lifted

from the lower social life of those times we begin to trace the outlines of the customs and institutions which gave warmth and interest to existence. Life for our forefathers was rigorous enough. Shut in by the walls of their narrow cities, or scattered over sparsely-peopled land, violence may have been common, famine was too often a reality, and pestilence was terrible enough; but when we get a glimpse of the every-day life of the burgher or villager, we see him to be a man by no means soured or cowed. Civic patriotism was vigorous. Trade, after its kind, struggled against the barriers which restricted it. Everywhere the church reared its massive tower in the centre of the community, gathering around it associations that formed the strongest bonds of union to the slowly growing elements of society.

The Church is, it may be said, herself an association, and one which claims to satisfy the truest and widest aspirations of man. What room is there within her boundaries, it might be asked, for these minor associations or fraternities, which detract from the sense of unity which she is to cherish within herself. The answer is practical. When she has been the strongest, and her influence been the most extensive, then it is that the tendency to develop subordinate unions within has always exhibited itself. The extensive character of her domain and the catholicity of her communion not only leave room for, but also invite, the natural cohesion in smaller groups of those who are attracted by mutual affinity, or united in common aims. Hence the scope for the monastic orders, gilds, and fraternities in the Middle Ages.

It is now time that we considered in greater detail the aims and purposes for which these institutions were founded and the various kinds of gilds that existed.

In medieval days they filled the place of friendly or benefit societies; but they paid much more attention to the claims of religion and morality than the friendly societies of modern days. Each member was a brother or a sister, and was treated as one of a large family. Should he become ill, poor, or infirm, he was supported by the gild. If his cattle were stolen, his house burnt or blown down, or if he should suffer loss by flood, shipwreck, or violence, the brethren of his gild would come to his rescue, supply his needs, and make good his loss.

If "any girl of the gild" wished to marry, the gild provided a dowry for her. When any brother or sister died, the gild paid the funeral expenses. Should any member desire to undertake a pilgrimage, his brethren of the gild helped him on the way; and some gilds provided even lodgings for pilgrims as they passed through the town.

These benefits alone are enough to show how numerous were the advantages conferred by a gild upon its members, and how much good they accomplished. But this is not all. Many of the gilds took in hand the repair of the parish churches and the up-keep of the church services. For instance, the gild at Swaffham, in Norfolk, undertook "the repair of the church, and the renovation of vestments, books, and other ornaments in the said church". Each gild had a chaplain, who was paid for taking the services, and for praying for the souls of the brethren. Those were days when every parishioner took his share in contributing something toward the cost of maintenance of divine services. None was left out; and if any one omitted to send his yearly offering, his name was recorded on the blacklist in the churchwardens' account books. Thus the people were taught to look upon the church as their own, to regard it as a priceless privilege, and gladly to contribute their Easter offerings. Hence money was always readily forthcoming to keep the fabric in good order; and in this matter the gilds were the chief helpers and supporters.

Moreover, the gilds often undertook the repair of bridges and roads, and of the walls and gates of fortified towns. They exercised their benevolence also in many works of charity—such as feeding the poor, providing lodgings for poor strangers, and establishing almshouses for the poor folk of their own town or village.

Religious Basis.

Although almost every gild was connected with the church, and had a religious basis, hardly any gild was solely and purely a part of church organization. All said prayers, all had lights, all came solemnly to hear Mass and invoke the services of the priest. There was no church gild but rested under the wing of some saint or angel, and many were under the protection of them all. The anniversary days were saints'

days, or were reckoned from them. But the church gilds were not of purely ecclesiastical influence and origin. In the majority of cases—at any rate until late in the Middle Ages—they were still less under ecclesiastical control. True, the parish priest was often the chaplain, and in some cases even one of the founders, but in others he was expressly excluded; and the gild was the fraternity of the good folk themselves.

The difference between the gild of a craft and the gild of the patron saint of that craft was one which, if it existed in every case (and this is doubtful), it is difficult to follow. The craft of the tailors, and the gild of "ye holy prophete Seynt Jon Baptist", were almost identical. The members of the one were probably members also of the other.

Nothing can be plainer than the fact that religious observances were closely interwoven with secular functions, that sacred rites often mingled with customs less distinctly devotional and spiritual. One knows not whether to admire or to smile when, in the rules of the gild at Stratford-on-Avon, we read of the prayers that were to be said over the great tankards of ale in that gild. But those were days when the water of that town was by no means so wholesome as the ale, inspected by the mayor and tasted by the "ale-conner". Those were days, too, when tea was yet unknown. "The *naïveté* of the documents is beyond suspicion. As we study their quaint simplicity, replete with shrewd touches of life, we can imagine no smile passing over the face of the scribe who engrossed them or the brethren who gave them loyal adhesion. Humor was there, but it was the grave humor of whole-hearted men. There was then no boundary line between the secular and the religious as there is with us now. Church and nation, parish and township, were one, different sides of the same life; prayers and feasting, worship and work, mourning and merriment, alternated without a thought of incongruity or inconsistency. It is the spirit of that bygone world of thought which was imaged in Dante, and which has now passed away before the haunting self-consciousness of modern civilization."

All the gilds strictly enjoined, by their rules, a due observance of the Sabbath. No member was allowed to ply his trade on the Sunday, nor after eight P. M. on Saturdays, but each was to keep holy the Sunday vigils and festival days, on

pain of six pounds of wax for every default. The rule for abstaining from all work on Sundays is a notable feature in nearly every gild ordinance.

Sometimes a Papal indulgence was gained by the gilds. Pope Julian II offered great incentments to the good people of Boston, in Lincolnshire. In order to encourage them to join the Gild of the B.V.M., established in that town, he held out these inducements — a pardon, which provided that any Christian person who should aid and support the chamberlain of the said gild should have five hundred years' pardon. His Holiness also allowed the brethren and sisters of the gild to eat eggs, milk, butter and flesh, on fast days and during Lent, by the advice of their spiritual pastor, without any scruple of conscience. Further, the merit of membership was to be accounted equal to a pilgrimage to Rome.

Town and Village Gilds.

Almost every inhabitant in England belonged in medieval days to some gild. Indeed, membership in a gild was necessary in towns to carry on any trade, business, or handicraft. No man dared to make or sell an article unless he belonged to the gild of that particular industry. Severe punishment and ruin overtook any tradesman who might be so adventurous and daring. In villages, too, almost everyone belonged to some gild.

These gilds were of a religious nature, and generally had a part of the parish church assigned to them. Men, women, and children each had their own gild. Each gild had its patron saint, and its separate altar, over which stood an image of the saint, and before it a perpetual light. The candles which shed this light were made of wax provided by the members of the gild; and fines for any breach of the rules were very often also levied in wax. For example, according to the rules of the Gild of St. John Baptist, at York, every member bound himself, that, if he was wrath with another member without reasonable cause, he would pay the first time a fine of one pound in wax, the second time two pounds of wax, and the third time that he would do whatever the warden of the gild should direct. Sometimes members left money in their will to support the lights of their gild. Robert Mylward be-

queathed, in 1530, "to the Lads' light 2d., and to the Maidens' light 2d".

The "Plough Monday" festivities, when "Old Bess" rattled her money-box whilst the ploughmen drew their plough from village to village, were the means of providing for the "ploughmen's light"; as the money collected on this occasion was, in pre-Reformation days, devoted to this purpose. The ploughmen's light burned before the altar of the Ploughmen's Gild. The Reformation put out the light, but could not extinguish the custom.

Plough Monday is the Monday next after Twelfth Day, and not the Monday after the Epiphany. Formerly it was of great account in England, and a rustic festival was held on this day. The season between Christmas and Twelfth Day was one in which formerly very little work was done. Every landlord feasted his farm tenants, and every farmer feasted his servants and laborers. As early as the ninth century, the twelve days after, excluding Midwinter Day, were given up to festivity, and servants (or slaves, as they were) were forbidden to work during those days. The Saxon nobles entertained their retainers, and the farmers entertained their men. It is one of the very oldest holidays on record, and dates from very early times. In fact, Plough Monday was celebrated in East Anglia and Northumbria almost before there were even churches, in which candles could be lighted if they could be obtained. After keeping Saint Monday (as Plough Monday was often called) the ploughmen resumed work early the next day. It was a point of honor for each laborer to be at his work betimes on this Tuesday morning. If a farm hand could get the start of the farm maid, and show himself in the kitchen before she had got the kettle on, he could claim a cock for Shrove Tuesday at the master's expense. The old churchwardens' accounts have abundant references to moneys paid to the "processioners" on this day. The ploughmen kept a light burning before their altar in church to obtain a blessing on their work; and many a country inn used to be graced with the sign "God speed the plough". Rude though it was, the plough procession threw a life into the dreary scenery of winter, as it came winding along the quiet rutted lanes on its way from one village to another; for the farm hands from the surround-

ing hamlets, and from many a lonely farmhouse, united in the celebration of Plough Monday, the last day of festivity and leisure before returning to the hard, dreary, and long labor that is the lot of the "sons of the soil". Thus did our forefathers strive to allure youth to their duty (as in the case of the Shrovetide cock, which was claimed by those who were earliest at work the next day), and provided them with innocent mirth as well as with hardy, honest labor.

Social Unions with Higher Aims.

Merely as social unions the old gilds are deserving of honor and study; for, had they been nothing more, they worthily filled an important and useful place during the centuries of their existence. But they were much more. Other, and far higher, aims they had learned to prize. We do these good brethren a gross injustice if we regard their gilds as nothing better than clubs. True, they were social unions, with a fixed payment (in many cases), a close connexion with the Church, and with periodical holiday feasts. This alone would make them worthy of more than passing interest and study. But besides and above all this there were two important and marked features that characterized the old gilds, and which gave them greater practical usefulness and higher religious and social significance. It was the exercise of two very laudable and necessary functions. These two functions were charity to the living, and peculiar regard and care for the memory and welfare of the dead.

There has been too great a tendency on the part of students and historians of these gilds to dwell exclusively on the former of these aspects. Though the gilds have justly been described as the friendly and provident associations, the insurance societies, the clubs, and the trade unions of the Middle Ages, it would be difficult to say, and probably no generalization on the subject could be accurately made, whether the gilds presented to their contemporaries the spectacle of institutions chiefly social, or charitable, or religious. The fact is, these elements varied in their proportions in different localities and in different gilds of the same town. It is with this word of caution that we proceed to say something of the works of charity of these gilds.

It may safely be asserted that charity of some kind and in one form or another was a universal feature of the gilds. The kindly feeling it cherished must have been a most wholesome element in the contemporary society of the community where it existed. This charity to the living so zealously exercised by the gilds was of two kinds: it was both internal and external.

The first objects of a gild were ever, and often exclusively, the members of that gild. This is evident from the rules of the various gilds.

Ludlow: If any brother (or sister) should be wrongfully imprisoned, the gild was to do its utmost in spending money to get him out. "If any of our poorer brethren or sisteren fall into grievous sickness, they shall be helped, both as to their bodily needs and other wants, out of the common fund of the gild." Should any member become "a leper, or blind, or maimed in limb, or smitten with any other incurable disorder, we wish that the goods of the gild shall be largely bestowed on him". Again, if any good girl of the gild, of marriageable age, wished to marry or enter a religious house, and her father had not the means, "friendly and right help shall be given her out of our means and common chest, toward enabling her to do whichever of the two she wishes".

Coventry: "If any brother or sister of the gild becomes so feeble, through old age or through any worldly mishap, that he has not, and cannot earn, the means of living, he shall have such help at the cost of the gild, that he shall not need to beg his bread." Out of the goods and chattels of this gild means of living were found for thirty-one men and women who were unable either to work or to find a means of livelihood, and this at a charge of £35-5-0 per annum. This was an instance of the gild's external charity, as the former was of their internal charity.

Chesterfield: The provision made by the Chesterfield Gild was characteristic. "If any brother is sick and needs help, he shall have a halfpenny daily from the common fund of the gild, until he has got well. If any of the brethren fall into poverty, they shall go singly, on given days, to the houses of the brethren, where each shall be courteously received, and there shall be given him, as if he were master of the house, whatever he wants of meat, drink, and clothing, and he shall

have a halfpenny like those that are sick; and then shall he go home in the name of the Lord."

Hull: Corpus Christi Gild. The charity dispensed by this gild was strictly practical. "If it befall that any brother or sister become, by mishap, so poor that help is needed, twenty shillings shall be granted to him for one year, to enable him to follow his calling. And if he cannot earn the twenty shillings in that year, he shall keep the money for another year. And if then he cannot earn it, with increase, nor make his living, he shall have it for another (third) year, so that he may make a profit out of it. And if, through no fault of his own, he can get no increase even in the third year, then the money shall be released to him."

Hull: St. John Baptist Gild. Here it further provided that five shillings should be given to each of the afflicted, at the Feast of St. Martin, in winter, to buy a garment. But the strictly business-like character of this charity is marked by the further provision, in these Hull gilds, that in each case, except only in extreme necessity, a deduction was to be made to cover the regular yearly payments due from the afflicted members to the gild.

Charity in a wider sense, too, was carefully nourished. "Inasmuch as the gild was founded to cherish kindness and love, the alderman, steward, and two help-men shall, in case of a quarrel arising between members, deal with the matter, and shall earnestly strive to make the quarrellers agree together, without any suit or delay, and so that no damage, either to body or goods, shall in anywise happen through the quarrel." If the officials neglected to compose the quarrel, they were to pay four pounds of wax between them. If the quarrellers would not listen, "they shall pay four pounds of wax". And, finally, if the officials could not agree in the matter, "then all and every of the gild shall be summoned to meet, and the matter in difference shall be discussed before them, and be referred to them for settlement". It was, in fact, a common rule that no brother should go to law with brother—a rule which has not only apostolic authority, but even goes back to the gilds of the heathen, which were contemporary with, and prior to, St. Paul.

The extent of the external charity of the gilds is less easy to determine. It was a common, and possibly even a universal, practice among them that, on the occasion of their annual feast, portions should be given to the poor who were not of their gild.

Grantham: It was a rule of the gild at Grantham that, on the day of the Gild Feast, each man, married or single, was to feed one poor person. And to the Friars Minor of the town, who had gone in procession with the gild, were also given fourteen loaves, eight gallons of ale, and half a kid or sheep.

Birmingham: Allusion has already been made to the tankards of ale, at Ludlow, which were given to the poor before the Gild Feast began. But there were other, and more far-reaching, works of charity done by many gilds. The Holy Cross Gild, at Birmingham, was founded in 1392, by the bailiffs and commonalty of the town, on the basis of a chantry originally founded in Henry II's reign. It had chaplains to celebrate the Mass in St. Martin's Church, for, even in those days, Birmingham contained two thousand "houseling" people. It kept in repair two great stone bridges and divers foul and dangerous ways. It also maintained almshouses for twelve poor persons, and other charities.

The Report of the Commissioners of Henry VIII stated of this gild: "There be divers poor people found aided and suckered of the said Gild, as in money, bread, drinks, coals." And their successors, sent by Edward VI, reported: "There be relieved and maintained upon the possessions of the same gild (and the good provision of the Master and brethren thereof) twelve poor persons, who have their houses rent-free, and all other kinds of sustenance, as well food and apparel as all other necessaries."

Beverley: The gild in this minster-town was dedicated to St. Elene, the holy mother of Constantine, who found the Holy Rood. The aldermen and stewards of this gild were bound to maintain two, three, or four bed-ridden poor folks while they lived; and, when these died, they were to bury them, and choose others in their place, and in like manner maintain them. Lights were kept burning in honor of St. Elene, and any money in hand at the year's end was spent by the gild in repairing its chapel, and in gifts to the poor.

While paying regard to the wants and benefits of the living, the gilds were not forgetful of the memory and welfare of the dead. The duties due to the departed were their especial concern. They carried out these functions with great attention to detail and a remarkable degree of delicacy. Truly, the world of the departed loomed larger, as well as nearer, in the mind of our forefathers than it does with the majority of their descendants in the twentieth century. As witness, here are some of the rules of the many gilds which so tenderly fostered a veneration and memory of the dead.

Ludlow: According to the rules of the Palmers' Gild, at Ludlow, "If any man wishes, as is common, to keep night watches with the dead, this will be allowed, on the condition that he does not call up ghosts (monstra larvarum inducere)."

It is here that we come in contact with what was undoubtedly one of the fundamental and vital principles of the old gilds, a principle, indeed, which was strong in the Middle Ages, but which was as potent in far more ancient times, and links the medieval gild to the *collegium* of Rome and the brotherhoods of both East and West. Regard for the memory and welfare of the dead was, certainly, the universal practice with the old English gilds.

Lancaster: Note the rules of the gild in the old town of Lancaster. "On the death of any member of the gild all the brethren, then in the town, shall come to *Placebo* and *Dirige*, if summoned by the bellman, or pay twopence; all shall go to the Mass for a dead brother or sister; each brother or sister, so dying, shall have at the Mass, on the day of burial, six torches and eighteen wax-lights, and at other services two torches and four wax-lights; if any of the gild die outside the town, within twenty miles, twelve brethren shall wind and deck the body at the cost of the gild, and if the brother or sister so dying wished to be buried where he died, the same twelve shall see that he has fitting burial there where he died." Some of the gilds had a hearse and an embroidered pall which were used at funerals of members of the gild, and sometimes let out to others.

Lincoln: The rules of the gild at Lincoln enjoined that "When any brother or sister dies in Lincoln, two torches shall be kept burning about the body until it has been carried into

the church. The torches shall then be put out; afterward, the Mass being ended, the torches shall be lighted again, and shall be kept burning till the body is buried". Again, "When any of the bretheren or sisteren dies, the rest shall give a halfpenny each, to buy bread to be given to the poor, for the soul's sake of the dead."

Stamford: The ordinance that regulated the gild at Stamford is interesting: "It is ordeyned that when any broder or suster of this Gilde is deceased out of this world, then, withyn the thirty days [called the "Trental"] of that broder or suster, in the chirch of Seynt Poules, ye Steward of this Gilde shall doo Rynge for hym, and do to say a *Placebo* and *Dirige*, w^{t} a Masse on ye morowe of Requiem, as ye common use is. Att the which Masse, the Alderman of ye Gilde, or his Depute, shall offer ijd. for the same soule; and to ye Clerk for rynging ijd., and to the Belman for goyng aboute ye town jd. The seid *Dirige* to be holden on ye Fryday and it may be, and the Masse on ye morowe. All this to be doon on ye coste and charge of ye seid Gylde."

But the pageantry, so dear to the thought of the living and to the relations of the dead, was also provided by the gild. It was a valued privilege to know that the gorgeous pall of the gild would cover the departed, that the hearse should be put about it, with thirteen square wax-lights burning in four stands, with four angels, and four banners of the Passion with a white border, and scutcheons of the same, powdered with gold. For the hearse was not the hideous monstrosity of today. The old iron frame over the Marmion Tomb in the church of Tanfield, in Durham, serves to illustrate the original of which we have to witness the degenerate descendant.

In medieval days there was no pauper's funeral in store for the poor brother. For him too the light would burn; and though kith and kin were gone, his gild brethren would follow him, two-and-two, to his last resting-place.

What was the effect that time had upon these benign and venerable institutions? The merchant gilds became opulent and powerful, being the possessors of considerable property. The craft gilds had likewise made their way, winning wealth, and gaining both honor and privileges. Then came the great spoliation, the ruthless "Reformation" of the sixteenth cen-

tury, which materially disturbed the peaceful existence of all the gilds, both in England and on the Continent. The great city gilds of London, being especially wealthy, attracted the covetous eye of that arch-appropriator, Henry VIII of much-married memory. Not content with plundering the Church of her property—enriching his favorites with the spoils, and bestowing upon his courtiers wealth, lands and plate, which had been bequeathed to the Church—he needs must also deprive the gilds of their legitimate wealth, which he pharisaically deemed superfluous. This was but the beginning of a system of extortion which both the Tudors and Stuarts so successfully practised upon the old companies and gilds of London and other large towns.

How strange is the irony of fate! Not only was it the wealth of the gilds, but also their religious character, that wrought their spoliation and downfall. It was this feature in the medieval gilds of England—the feature which, above all others, reaches back to an immemorial antiquity, and seemed, in its nature, indestructible—that was one of the chief causes of their destruction. "To estimate the proportionate State policy, mere greed for plunder, and religious conviction, in the composite forces which disestablished the chantries, colleges, and gilds in Edward VI's reign, would be at this date impossible. But it is clear that, although we find instances of a confusion in the Reports of the Commissioners between chantries and gilds—which it is hard to believe was entirely due to ignorance—nevertheless, in striking at the gild property, the reforming party struck an effective blow at one of the mainstays of the old religious system. The pageantry connected with the Masses for the dead, obits, and maintenance of the chantry priests, was firmly rooted in the old gilds." This was accounted a sufficient reason for an unjustifiable plunder of the gilds. "Plunder there was, but it was a plunder which achieved a calculated end."

In 1545 a severe blow was aimed at every institution that was likely to yield booty to the spoiler. This was an Act for the dissolution of colleges. It stated that "divers colleges, chantries, free-chapels, hospitals, fraternities, brotherhoods, guilds, and stipendiary priests, having perpetuity forever, had misapplied the possessions thereof in various ways"; and en-

joined that all the same should be dissolved, and the proceeds applied for supporting the King's expenses in wars, the maintenance of the crown, etc. Was there ever a more palpable instance of the practice of "robbing Peter to pay Paul"?

In the following reign the unscrupulous ministers of Edward VI proceeded at once to take advantage of this Act, and began their iniquitous work of spoliation. Special commissioners were appointed, who proceeded to send to each town very minute inquiries concerning the gilds and fraternities, and especially concerning the property, goods, ornaments, and chattels, etc., which they possessed. The suppression of the gilds, "on the pretext of their prayers for the deceased members, and the confiscation of their property (except in London, whose great trading gilds were too powerful to be meddled with), was the very meanest and most inexcusable of the plunderings which threw discredit upon the Reformation."

It is probable that the good people loved their gilds too well to return a full and accurate account of all their possessions, for, although the majority of these ancient and benevolent institutions were swept away by the unjust and scandalous measures of the King's advisers, a few managed to weather the storm, survive the spoliation, and maintain their existence.

By a curious cynicism we are now confronted with a modern revival of the gild. Once again it is a living institution in the religious life of England. Even in the eclectic circles of Nonconformity we find here and there an institution establishing itself under the venerable and venerated name of a gild. But the modern imitations come far short of their ancestors. Not only are they, in form, character, aims, and sympathies, very different institutions from the old gilds of medieval days, but they are also far less beneficent.

Few institutions have contributed more to the making of England than the gilds. It is to these ancient fraternities that we must look if we would follow the improvement in the condition of the craftsmen and merchants, and the development of commercial industries. To understand aright the social conditions of the townsfolk of England, and the origin of her municipal government, etc., we must turn to a study of the history of her gilds. In manifold ways they were boons to the

country and benefactors to the individual. It would be difficult to over-estimate the extreme usefulness of these grand institutions, or to over-state the great debt England owes to them.

Not the least advantage which these gilds procured for their members was that of protection. By uniting together, the burghers became strong, and could resist the tyranny of unjust kings or of powerful earls and barons; thus securing their persons against violence and imprisonment, and their property from robbery and confiscation. In days when might was right, it was a great thing for the liberties and rights of the English people that a power should spring up which, by the force of unity, could cope with lawless robbers, protect and preserve the freedom of the subject, and withstand the tyranny of the great.

We must bear in mind that though these gilds were based on the principle of coöperation, and the mutual respect, honor and faith, which each brother felt for another, it was not simply a matter of money, with fixed contributions and fixed rates of disbursement, like our modern friendly societies, but that each brother gave what he could afford, and in case of distress received what he required.

The more one studies the history of the old English gilds the more evident becomes the important part they played in fashioning the fortunes of England, for they were the foundation of many institutions which she so much prizes at the present day. To them she owes her municipal system of government, her borough laws, her trade, commerce, lighthouses, etc. To them our forefathers were indebted, in lawless times, for the protection of person and property, of rights and liberties; and for what they enjoyed of prosperity, peace, and settled government, in days of tyranny, oppression, insecurity, and unrest. And to them may be attributed the many social pleasures, the many happy days and hours of harmless mirth, which diversified the lives of our forefathers, and made them a light-hearted, contented, and reliant people. One fact remains beyond dispute: it is that, in a period when various forms of evil abounded, the medieval gild was a panacea for many a social and personal ill.

Those who through each forgotten age,
With patient care will look,
Will find her fate in many a page
Of Time's extended book.

It is the gild which, in the Middle Ages, was the handmaid of the Church. They worked side by side for the general good; they went hand in hand for the common weal, and they stood shoulder to shoulder together against oppression, violence, and wrong. No student of the medieval period can afford to neglect a study of the gilds, which to appreciate aright, and to view in proper proportion and perspective, he must approach with a broad and unbiased mind. During its days of existence, the gild made for much that was good; and through it the times, both contemporary and later, have been so much the better. It stood *in loco parentis* to many an orphan and minor. *Fiat justitia ruat coelum* was its motto. *Nisi Dominus frustra* was its ruling spirit. Of the ancient gild it may truly be said:

In Britain's earlier annals thou wert set
Among the cities of our sea-girl isle:
Of what thou wert—some tokens linger yet
In yonder ruins; and this roofless pile,
Whose walls are worshipless, whose tower—a mark,
Left but to guide the seaman's wandering bark!
Yet where those ruins gray are scattered round,
The din of commerce fill'd the echoing air;
From these now crumbling walls arose the sound
Of hallow'd music, and the voice of prayer:
And this was unto some, whose names now cease
A harbor of refuge, the place of peace!

JOHN R. FRYAR.

Canterbury, England.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE PRIEST AND ADVERTISING AGENTS.

CONTACT between the priest and the world of business men occurs at many more points than one supposes. Besides the transactions of all sorts which he attends to personally, there are countless ways in which the pastor's name either as an individual or as a unit of a highly respected and influential body is made to do commercial service. It is my purpose in this paper to direct attention to certain phases of this service, in which clever advertisement canvassers make use of the

priest's name and influence to fill their own pockets or to promote their personal interests, not infrequently to the prejudice of religion and the reputation of its sacred ministers. Very little of this traffic is suspected by the clergy, for the simple reason that those who are responsible for it keep an innocent-looking front over their schemes. These are of various kinds and they are working harm to many ecclesiastical interests, besides hurting the reputation of the body clerical for good sense and honorable dealing. They are all the more a nuisance because of the fact that whilst the priest is very rarely aware of the unauthorized use of his name, the business man who is duped is equally unaware that the priest himself is an unsuspecting victim. As a result the layman is apt to blame the churchman, and too often the Church itself, whereas the priest meantime has no opportunity to protect himself. In the exceptional instances in which the pastor does know of the trading on his priestly prestige, he cannot know all that the agent undertakes to say without authority, or he cannot see the implications of what is thus said and done.

The commonest abuse of this kind is found in the canvassing of advertisements for religious publications. The name of this category of printing is legion, and nearly all of it is made to carry business announcements of every sort. There are programs for church entertainments and charity lectures, souvenirs for jubilee celebrations of church and school and club, convention booklets, reports of societies and religious bodies, annuals and calendars, and special anniversary numbers of religious periodicals, without end. They all offer an opportunity to raise money for purposes in sore need of funds, through the advertisements that may be secured for them. These will pay for the printing of the pamphlet or book and maybe leave a good margin of profit over. It is worth while to inquire into the profits and the costs of this flourishing but unwholesome activity under the Catholic name.

It will be a matter of surprise to many to know that as a rule seventy-five per cent of the profits that come from this business goes to the promoters of the publications and their solicitors. In one of our large cities (and in this it is not unlike the rest) there are reputed to be a round score of these canvassers who are permanently on the ground, and employed

week in and week out on Catholic work of this character. It is their only means of livelihood. Besides these regulars, there are the migratory canvassers who follow from diocese to diocese the big souvenir books and special numbers of periodicals. for the bigger financial yield in them. These men and women reap a rich harvest—these and the promoters who conduct the bureaus for the handling of these advertising prints and who employ the solicitors on a commission basis.

When one of these bureaus or agencies takes over a job of this kind, it contracts as a rule to share the profits of the enterprise equally with the party of the first part (who is the pastor of the parish generally), after the printing and "other incidental expenses" are paid. It looks at first blush as though the division of the gross returns would be about "fifty-fifty". But it is far from that. Experience has shown that, after the charges for the printing and the "other incidental expenses" are deducted, the party of the first part is lucky to get twenty-five per cent of the total amount paid for the advertisements. The party of the second part, however, viz. the promoter, gets about sixty per cent of the gross returns. The other fifteen per cent is shared by the printer and the smaller canvassers, in the ratio of about two to the latter and one to the printer. The promoter of the scheme gets fifty per cent of the net proceeds in his quality as the party of the second part, and then over and above this pays himself a commission on all the business he writes personally. In this way his share is usually sixty per cent of the net profit. Religion, under its various aspects, thus gets about twenty-five cents of every dollar collected in its name.

Although it is impossible to ascertain the exact amount of money paid for advertisements in Catholic mediums of this variety, it has been estimated that in one city alone last year $200,000 was spent for this purpose. Of this sum about $12,000 was paid for printing, $138,000 was gobbled up by the bureau and its canvassers, and $50,000 was the portion that was rescued for the religious and charitable purposes back of the undertaking. These projects are plainly on a wrong basis. They are made to serve the interests of the professional canvasser; the charity or ecclesiastical cause whose name they carry and whose purposes they are supposed to promote are secondary. It is well that this condition should be recognized.

The profits for religion in this business — twenty-five cents on every dollar—are now all told; not so the costs. There is a still more regrettable phase of the business. I refer to the mean and dishonest methods employed in getting the advertisements. They are so many that it will be possible to mention a few only. Every one of the instances that shall be given is taken from actual and somewhat recent experience.

Once the bureau has secured the contract to solicit the advertisements, its next step is to get the names and addresses of the business houses with which the parish or school or society deals. This information is gleaned in various ways, and with it a list of the party of the first part's friends who are in business and their connexions. It matters very little whether or not there is any trade return likely to warrant these firms taking space in the program or souvenir; that is a consideration which hardly enters into the negotiation at all. Publications of the sort under review would go rather bare of advertisements if they were measured by their own "pulling" merits. As the business *quid pro quo* is not there, the professional campaigner has to resort to other avenues of approach to the merchant. For instance, Father So-and-so has asked the solicitor to be sure to call on his friend, Mr. Business Man. The latter is very glad, of course, and asks the solicitor to tell the good Father of his appreciation—and he buys the space he doesn't want, with seeming good grace. In nine cases out of ten it is simply a donation, though he may or may not know that about three-quarters of his contribution will never go to Father So-and-so at all. Many of the advertisers are like this "friend".

Some of the prospective advertisers yield to the blandishment less easily, and thereby give the canvasser a chance to display his unenviable skill. "Father So-and-so had intended calling himself and was sure of a page" from this advertiser. "Father would be very greatly disappointed if he knew of your hesitation, for your name was mentioned very particularly this morning. And besides, Mr. Piano-Dealer, Father said something about a new instrument he intended buying here this week." In the same way, the carpet manufacturer, the altar-builder, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick-maker are roped in. When the advertisement appears, the bill is

paid, but the imaginary piano and the rest are still unpurchased. Meantime the agent's industry has been richly rewarded, though the priest's share is thrice smaller, unless we count the fair-sized grudge the piano man and the others have put on the contra side of his account.

The next man the agent sees is different again. He is known throughout the neighborhood as a leader in a Protestant Sunday school, perhaps a trustee or an elder of his church. At first the publication has very little interest for him. But "Father So-and-so sent the canvasser directly to him to assure him that he (the pastor) did not for a moment believe the rumor that this church member had discharged his Catholic employes because of their religion, and he (the pastor) wanted the trustee to put an advertisement in the Catholic publication just to prove that the rumor is false". Otherwise the church warden would surely lose his Catholic customers. Of course, no report of the kind is abroad, though the agent roundly asserts that he knows it is common property and that the Catholics of the district are bent on reprisals. It may be that, instead of discharging the Catholic employes, the unoffending Sunday school teacher is accused of distributing copies of the *Menace*, or of contributing to its support, or other prejudiced activity against the Church. Few tradesmen can withstand arguments of this kind, and the price of the advertisement is considered small if it will enable Father So-and-so, as maliciously promised, to clear away the false charge and ward off the bogus boycott.

When the deceptions so far mentioned fail, thinly-veiled threats may be resorted to. These too fail sometimes, but the reason why they have any success at all is because the schemers are adepts, and the victims as a rule are the small fry in business. They are exceedingly sensitive to anything that may handicap them in a competition which is already well-nigh disheartening. Their fears are easily wrought on and force them to give their assent to the advertising proposal, though from the standpoint of publicity it is so much money wasted. It is small wonder such tradesmen look askance at such advertising, and resent the priest's supposed part in them.

Another species of this "hold-up", as it may be called, or blackmail, is practised with the so-called "souvenir" publi-

cation. Let us take a concrete case by way of illustration. An institution is about to commemorate its silver or golden jubilee; or a parish or diocese is preparing festivities for its jubilarian pastor or bishop. It is proposed to publish a souvenir—the proposal is sure to be made by one of the advertising bureaus; they are always on the look-out for these openings. We shall suppose the occasion to be commemorated is the jubilee of a very prominent churchman. The bureau organizes itself under a high-sounding name. It has brand-new stationery engraved. This time it is no longer the party of the second part; it constitutes itself the party of the first part, and looks about for some priest to be the party of the second part. He is made the editor of the souvenir volume, at a liberal salary, though his editorial duties are practically nil. His main function will be the writing of a brief historical introduction to the handsome souvenir, though the chief purpose of his editorship is to lend the bureau the use of his name. It appears on the engraved stationery, and his signature is stamped at the foot of the letters which go out from the company's office. These letters are addressed to the leading professional and business men of the neighborhood, who are most politely invited, as cherished and personal friends of the distinguished prelate, to permit the editor of the handsome souvenir to make the volume more valuable by the use of their portraits in the book. A special few of the close friends and admirers of the jubilarian have been selected, and it is proposed to form, as it were, a gallery of their portraits, for it is thought in this way to make a very fitting and a very charming present to their esteemed friend on the occasion of the approaching celebration. Their Mr. So-and-so will call for the portrait, which should not be sent until Mr. So-and-so sees whether it would lend itself to the special kind of reproduction to suit the size and paper and printing of the souvenir. Would the addressee be good enough to sign the engraved card signifying his assent to this proposal and state in the space set apart for the purpose the date and hour when Mr. So-and-so should call?

The stationery is very elegant, and the priest-editor's name is engraved in the upper left-hand corner and signed at the foot of the letter. The editor never wrote the letter and will

only learn by chance that such a letter has been written and sent out under his signature. When the polished and elegant and resourceful Mr. So-and-so calls on the "admiring friend", he will find the latter of many varieties. The admiring friend may be a very innocent person who has laid the flattering unction to his soul and got out his best portrait ready for the gallery. After the admiring friend has been initiated and knows that a place in the gallery costs from $250 to $50, according to the portrait's position and space in the volume, his kindly feeling toward the editor may or may not be increased. If the admiring friend is not over vain and has good courage, he will reject the wheedling offer of a place in the gallery. But it does take courage to do that, and get rid of the solicitor. Here is big game for this hunter and he is not easily shaken off now that he is fairly on the trail of his quarry. To change the metaphor, the resourceful solicitor is nothing if he is not polite, and it is not easy to be brusque in the face of such exquisite manners. He must be got rid of somehow; but how? By surrender generally—unless one has *great courage.* Do the admiring friends blame the solicitor? Not so much as they blame the editor, the unsuspecting priest.

In this connexion let me relate the experience of a friend. He had business dealings with a certain house with which he spent several thousand dollars a year. The president of the firm thanked him one day for "that letter". "What letter?" asked my friend. It was explained that he had received one of the admiring-friend letters. My friend was still more puzzled; he did not know of the souvenir book. The recipient of the letter assured my friend that he was glad to receive the latter and grateful to his guileless customer for suggesting his name, and was willing to take a space for $150. There and then a light shone on the whole transaction, and my friend was afforded an opportunity to make it plain that merely because a Catholic was a large buyer from a firm that was no reason why its president should be put under tribute for schemes hiding under a Catholic mask. That was the lever used to lift the president of the firm, who was a Jew, into the gallery of admiring friends of a Catholic churchman. As a matter of fact, the net result of this mischievous interference with other people's affairs is a money profit to the bureau at

the expense and annoyance of business houses and their Catholic customers, and the priest-editors.

With variations of one kind or another this dodge is kept working in different places. It assumes a somewhat different aspect in the special anniversary numbers of Catholic newspapers and in the advertisement-laden and cheap-looking "souvenirs" that are often published on the occasion of conventions of Catholic societies. These publications are usually suggested by the band of itinerant solicitors who get the sanction for the enterprise from the heads of the organization on the promise of turning in the proceeds for the expenses of the meeting. The proceeds for this purpose are small at the best, whatever the bureau's profits may be; whilst, on the other hand, the bureau's methods are prejudicial to the interests of religion.

Within recent weeks one of these bureau managers was busy working up sentiment in a certain diocese for a Knight of Columbus book. Nothing of the kind had been done in the district, he said, and there was big money in it. The promoter of the project was a Mystic Shriner and had himself put upward of $5,000 into a Masonic souvenir of the kind a few years ago in the city where he is now anxious to operate on the Knights of Columbus. It did not signify what name the volume should bear. He thought "Rise and Growth of the K. of C. in ——" would be an acceptable title. If the plan was approved by the authorities, under the urging that the proceeds would be a nice sum for charitable purposes, or the nucleus of a fund for the building of a headquarters, or some such plan, a few "dummies"—that is, blank paper books of the size of the proposed publication, showing the style of binding, etc.—would be made, with full-page portraits of the Pope, of the bishop of the diocese, of half-a-dozen prominent priests and ranking officers of the society in half-tone. Armed with these the solicitors would sally forth to capture the Knights for a page or half-page at $50 or $25 respectively. Of course all the "prominent" men of the order are expected to take liberal space, flatteringly argues the solicitor. They owe that much to themselves, not to speak of the support of the project itself; and then the profits are to go to such a worthy object. A copy of the precious volume is given free with a

$50 space; those who take only a half-page would be asked to pay the nominal sum of $2.50 extra for a copy; and those who can't afford to buy space, should at least sign the order blank for a copy of this history, written by Father So-and-so —$5.00 a copy. There are all sorts of motives back of the decisions men make, and the professional solicitor has full room here for the play of his resource.

It may be added here that the promoter who had this plan of a Knight of Columbus souvenir in mind, proposed at the same time a jubilee number of a certain periodical, published at long intervals. The publication he had in mind is the organ of a society whose membership is very largely local and not without influence in its community. A rare opportunity for the mischievous use of their names, cleric and lay.

Nearly all the work of these men and women solicitors is shot through with dishonesty. The big money rewards in it attract the unscrupulous. If the prospective advertiser is slow to yield, the number of copies of the publication is represented as several times larger than the actual figure. Positive promises are made that are never to be fulfilled; influence is invoked without any authorization; signatures are secured to contracts under verbal agreements that are later denied; money is collected in advance and not reported till it is too late to recover, and so forth. It happens not infrequently that certain men who prefer for one reason or another not to have their names appear in the pamphlet — perhaps because they know that the Presbyterian, or Baptist, or Episcopal organ would then make a claim on their advertisement, or because they have nothing to advertise for the particular circle of readers of this or that medium, or for other reasons—wish to show their good will by making a contribution. The charitable or religious purpose which elicited the kind act are apt to benefit very little from these unknown contributions. Other advertisers who do not wish their names published ask that the space they buy should simply say "Compliments of a Friend". This legend is seen occasionally in these publications, and when each "friend" sees it he is satisfied that he is the one meant; so are the other "friends". It is impossible to say how many of them paid for that space, and whether the moneys of each of them were applied as they wished; but

it is known for certain that some of these donations and others of somewhat similar nature don't get any further than the bureau. These thefts are aggravated by the fact that they are done under the shadow of religion and of charity and are made possible thereby.

By a strange coincidence, just this moment there has been submitted to the writer a letter under date of 1 December, 1915, from a firm that sells much of its product to the clergy. It is worth citing because it exemplifies the point of this rather cheerless paper—that is to say, the compromising features that are stamped all over these advertisements solicited for Catholic mediums on any but a business basis of a *quid pro quo*. The letter in question encloses an advertisement, and then expresses regret that it cannot advertise in a certain medium as much as the firm believes its interests warrant, and the following reason is given:

> If we were not *obliged* to place so much advertising in other mediums, it would be a pleasure for us to appear in your work regularly; but our appropriation is necessarily limited, and we must make it go as far as possible amongst *the institutions whose trade we get.*

If the name of this concern and the article it sells might be mentioned here, it would be seen how useless their advertisement is in the mediums of "the institutions whose trade [they] get". Those who solicit or accept this class of advertisements are receiving a doubtful alms. A certain firm of merchants has said that its annual appropriation for this purpose reaches as high as $30,000. In these days of close competitive bidding for trade, some one must pay the freight for these unproductive and grudged expenditures, and in the opinion of a wide-awake and successful man of affairs, who expressed his view on the subject to the writer several years ago, it is "the institutions" themselves that pay in the long run. It should be remembered too that they probably pay the full amount, whereas the printer's bill and the canvasser's commission must be deducted from the sum that the institutions receive from the advertiser. This does not take into account the ugly feature of the hold-up of the firm that gets "the institution's trade" and is "obliged" to place advertisements in their organs. The best rule is to pay as you go

and avoid these tangling alliances between business and religion.

It would not be fair to put all the solicitors for the organs here referred to in the faker class. Naturally enough, there are some honest canvassers among them, though the honest ones unfortunately are generally incompetent. The business they write is small, and their canvass is based on the appeal to charity rather than on the merits of the space they are supposed to sell. Many of these are women, of great timidity, and an appeal to pity in themselves. Occasionally, however, the advertisements are secured by volunteers who draw no commission, misrepresent nothing, and deal squarely all round. But even in these rare cases there is little excuse for soliciting the advertisement, for the advertiser is prompted by the charity rather than the publicity offered.

The cheats that have been mentioned are merely specimens of the misalliance between religion and the professional promoter of the prints under consideration. The least of the evils of this miserable commerce is the escape, from the charity to be benefited, of three-quarters of the funds given in its name. Among the worst of the bad fruits, aside from downright dishonesty and stealing by some of the solicitors, is the compromise of religion in the eyes of those business men who are deceived into seeing the hand of the priest where it is not engaged at all.

EXPERTO CREDE.

THE SENTIMENTALISTS.

FOR some years past it has been noticeable that critics of our times frequently use the word "sentimentalism" wherewith to sum up their disgust at so much in this age that really does seem to call for harsh rebuke. The present writer confesses that this word has played an extensive rôle in his own vocabulary. For that reason it has seemed quite timely to stop and ask oneself what, after all, one means by sentimentalism. It is a hard question, but doubtless upon its answer will depend much of the correctness of our strictures upon modern thought.

I started out by asking people, "What is sentimentality?" and "What is sentiment?" A breezy party from Chicago answered as follows: "Sentiment is what makes you pay fifty dollars a year to store worthless old furniture (worth ten dollars all told), because your first-born bumped his head on that table, and your eldest sister started housekeeping with the other stuff. Sentimentality is why wives leave home and children to go and live in a bungalow with long-haired affinities who finally desert them. It is why some of these seventeen-year-old girls come to Chicago from little country towns and marry thieves and degenerates, when the butcher-boy at home would have made them ever so happy and they would have been sure of at least their sausage."

This is quite true—we feel it to be so—and it is also very hard common sense rather deliciously put. But it is only a description, not a definition. And we are after some sort of a definition.

So, in my next attempt, I came east to Washington, surely a city where one least expects to meet with sentimentalism. There an acquaintance answered my query as follows: "What is sentimentalism? That's a hard nut to crack, and the longer I hammer at it, the harder the shell seems to become. Our friend (a university professor) seems to find nothing subtle in it. To him a sentimentalist is merely one with a superabundance of sentiment. He cited Mrs. Hemans as embodying the idea of a sentimentalist. To him there is no idea of sham or hypocrisy in the content of the word. To me there is, and I judge from what you say that you find yourself using the word whenever you find yourself disgusted with modern ways of thinking and acting. I concluded, upon reflection, that one of the characteristics of the sentimentalist is a lack of spontaneity, and in many cases, but not necessarily, of sincerity. *A sentimentalist to me is one who thinks his feelings instead of feeling them*, one who tries to cultivate what should originate spontaneously, as one who knows a tune but cannot sing. I do not mean by this that all feeling is unreasonable, though much of it is, but it is generally based on unconscious reasoning. Did you ever read Amiel's Journal? Amiel is my idea of a sentimentalist. He thought feelings to such an extent that he paralyzed his capacity for feeling them. That would

explain your idea of its being a *weakness of the mind*, because, according to my idea, it is the mind overworking itself by trying to do its own work and that of the heart."

This estimate struck me as quite clever, to say the least. Yet it leaves much in doubt. Certainly sentimentalism is emotionalism gone wrong because of lack of control; but what is the reason why the modern man should so often lose such control and allow his thinking and feeling to become so ludicrously mixed?

A chance remark of Chesterton's read somewhere (I forget just where) gives a clue to what seems to me nearer the right solution. In substance it is to the effect that too much seriousness is a sign of a lack of virile religion or faith. For religion is essentially endowed with a sense of humor, of joyousness, because it sees all things in their proper relation. And I recall that somewhere else he implies that a sentimentalist is one who grasps an idea without its inferences—which is the same fault of not seeing all things in their proper relations.

Now, then, I suspect that we are pretty near to at least the essential qualities of sentimentalism, even if an adequate definition must remain unattainable. Here we have them—emotion unrestrained by cool reason, reason led astray by emotionalism, over-seriousness in the cult of one idea because of inability to see that idea in its relations with all other ideas or its logical inferences, lack of mental perspective—all harking back very largely to a lack of virile faith, the great faith which sees all life about us as only part of the stupendous architecture of creation in general. Or, to put it still more briefly and risk some sort of a definition, I should propose this as a tentative definition, to wit: "Sentimentalism is a mental weakness generally induced by a lack of virile religion and manifesting itself chiefly in emotionalism unregulated by a sense of humor." There you have it—the fact which is mental weakness or flabbiness, the ordinary phenomena which are a seriocomic emotionalism, the basic cause which is a lack of virile religion. Let this do for a starter, anyhow. And now to the reasons for what must at first reading seem a most far-fetched statement.

The reader will please begin his study with those beings which certainly cannot be termed sentimental, and I think he

will find that they all manifest, as far as their limited natures go, precisely the content of my definition.

Inanimate things, for instance, surely are not sentimental. Of course not, you reply, because with them there is no question of mentality at all, let alone *weak* mentality. True! But they bear upon them the impress of Another's mentality which ever seems so sure, so calm, so big, so restful, yet so harmonious, and (in a big sense) so humorous and so religious—the impress of God the Creator. Inanimate nature always impresses the observer with its sanity, its obedience to law, its modulated reasonableness, its religiousness in the sense of its unconscious fulfilling of a creator's grand plan, its sense of humor in the sense of everything being in its proper place. There is nothing about it that is "foolish" (as we say), or irritatingly childish and impatient or ludicrous or contemptible. From a star to a grain of earth, from a delicate orchid down to the rankest weed—always the same calm reasonableness. And because of this, nature is never "sentimental". True, the sentimentalist can find inspiration for his vapid emotion in moonlight and star and flower. But even the sentimentalist knows in his cooler moments that such is a misinterpretation of that great, healthy sentiment that lies at the heart of nature itself.

The same is to be said of animals in a higher sense, in so far as their conscious life allows them more of an intelligent expression. Right here someone will mention the dog as an objection, that is, as a sentimentalist. But I think that is a libel on this lovable creature. No one, of course, will mention the cat—that incarnation of cool reason. No! the dog is not a sentimentalist, though chock-full of genuine sentiment from his wistful deep eyes clean to his eloquent tail. And I will give just one reason for this. A dog has too great a sense and love of sheer fun, is too good a boon-companion, in a word has too great a sense of humor to be a sentimentalist, for your true sentimentalist has none of these qualities. Let silly young girls and sillier old girls gush as they will over him, the dog nevertheless is not deceived. He knows in his dumb way that he is only a dog, very much annoyed by fleas in life and doomed to die and be forgotten thereafter — except by some sentimental old lady who may put a monument over him. No;

animals have sometimes more sense than humans as to ultimates. Even a cow, chewing its cud, seems to look clean through one as if to say: "Oh! let up! I know I'm only a cow; so go away with your Homeric sentimentalizing about 'cow-eyed' Juno and stop bothering me and my calf." There is about the animal creation always a serious sanity, a sense of proportion, a conviction of final Providence, and a sense of philosophic humor, i. e. of seeing everything in its proper relation to all others—from the delicate butterfly down to the coiled cobra—which is the very antithesis of sentimentalism, so strong, so marked, that one often gets ashamed of his humanity with its modern unconscious insincerity and lack of mental coherence.

But this only as an introductory by-word. Turning to humans, I would say that sentimentalism is a *modern* disease of the soul. There is naught of it in either classic or medieval times.

As to classic ages, just stand in thought before the Parthenon or pick up a page of Aristotle or read a tragedy of Euripides. Now, of course, these people were pagans as a race, allowing for individual exceptions. But, though pagans, they had a deep religious conviction of some sort or other, a big concept of life here and hereafter. And I say that, therefore, they had a great "faith". And because of that great "faith" they saw clearly, in proper perspective. And because they saw this way, their minds were well balanced; they saw all things in proper relation, and, therefore, never gave to one idea that undue prominence which seems to be an essential quality of a sentimentalist, who, as Mr. Chesterton says, wishes to grasp "an idea without its sequence". Hence the very moon-lit calm of the façade of the Parthenon, the judicious mental poise of Aristotle, the dramatic "art" of those inimitable tragedians, Euripides and Sophocles — approached by only one other subsequent dramatist, Shakespeare. Christian though I am, yet I feel this magnificent "poise" of that splendid Greek intellect, pagan though it was in its religion. I prefer it to this nauseating Christian sentimentalism which is the curse of modern life at least in Protestant America. But I am running ahead of my thesis.

Coming to medieval times, it is almost ridiculous to talk of sentimentalism. True, the façade of the Parthenon is different from those of the cathedrals at Siena and Milan and Cologne and Rouen. Times have changed. Differentiation has set in. But the one big thing remains, a great faith. No longer Jupiter and Mars and Venus and the ultimate "Parcae"; true. But Christ, and that superb world-wide organization which has been builded on the stone "rejected" by the builders. An immense religious idea which clashes a steel-clad Frank against a Mohammedan Emir on the field of Ascalon and bends the knees of an Emperor before a priest at Canossa. Sentimentalism in Hildebrand or Richard or Godfrey? It is idle to even think of it. Nor even in such essential poets as Francis and Dante with all the exquisite tenderness of the one and the majesty of the other. In those days people saw clearly. They were sinners, as in the days of Aristotle, and had their eccentricities, but the *brain* was as sane and clear and poised by the banks of the Seine and Rhine as it was on the slope of the Acropolis long before. A big faith forced them to see things in perspective, in due relations; preserved them from letting any little idea or reform run away with their common sense. Superstitious? Yes! But a sane superstition which was at bottom a fault of observation of fact, and not of reasoning. Hard-headed, clear-headed, red-blooded people were these hard-fighting feudal peoples. Of sentiment they had plenty; witness their bleached bones whitening the road from Byzantium to Jerusalem, all for an idea; or read Francis's Ode to the Sun. But sentimentalism was an unknown vice. Their big faith, their world-wide view of all life preserved in them that ineffable "sense of humor" which kept them always "reasonable". They had no time nor use for fads; they looked life straight in the eyes and acted as sane, healthy men must act. This is why I love those ages with all their roughness. They are human and they do not sicken me as do these modern years which are without faith of any kind, despite their professed belief in all kinds, and which are a patent lie and a disgrace to the human intellect such as no other period of history can show.

Perhaps the reader has by this time suspected whither we are heading. For we now come to that crisis in the world's

history wherein, to my mind, lies the remote and first cause of "sentimentalism", that essential, corroding vice of modernism—I mean the Protestant Reformation.

From coarse, rough Martin Luther to modern "sentimentalism" is a long cry, I grant. But, nevertheless, I name that Augustinian friar as the parent. For, my chief grievance against Luther is not that he started a new heresy and schism, but that he *enfeebled the human brain*, and necessarily so. Curious, that he who is called the apostle of the rights of reason, should in reality have been the very one who, more than any other man in history, did precisely paralyze human reason. Also curious that the Catholic Church, so persistently charged by her foes with having enslaved reason to the tyranny of ecclesiastical authority, should be the very force which today is vindicating the rights of reason against the materialistic Pragmatist on the one hand, and on the other against the irrational sentimentalism of Protestantism.

Luther, I repeat, gave the human reason the deadliest blow it ever received and necessarily so, as a consequence of his apostacy. By doing away with all authority in matters of religion, by sweeping aside all tradition and human experience and the laboriously acquired religious common-sense of some fifteen centuries, he necessarily produced a condition of mental chaos wherein unguided emotionalism took the place of cool reason and revelation. Religious anarchy was the immediate result. And though early Protestantism out of sheer antagonism kept fairly vigorous as a motive force, it was not long before the inevitable results became apparent. Religious agnosticism came apace. Mankind came to the conclusion inevitably that it was impossible amidst the turmoil of jarring sects to find out the true religion. Religious truth became relegated to the unknowable.

The next step was quite in order. If religious truth be impossible to attain, then all truth is perhaps equally so. We cannot obtain absolute truth in anything, not even in science, as Spencer maintained and the Pragmatist reëchoes. All truth is purely relative, shifting; we are certain of nothing; we have only impressions, which may or may not register reality. Your Futurist and Cubist in art and music are expressions of that same fundamental agnosticism which colors the thought

of the average modern man from the philosopher down to the mechanic. Reason is spurned as a guide, its rights scorned, its inherent excellence ridiculed; logic is despised, and metaphysics smiled upon with good-natured tolerance. In a word, we have ceased to think, and the trail from this strange condition leads straight back to Wittenberg.

But, since we no longer follow reason, we must follow another guide, especially in religious experiences. Man cannot be content with the husks of agnosticism or crass materialism. He is restless and hungry for some sort of spiritual food. Hence we turn for guidance to our emotions, our feelings, and are just now indulging in a very debauch of emotionalism. Questions affecting every phase of life are discussed now as they never were before, and discussed with less sense than they ever were. They are confidently approached without any mental preparation by the most ignorant and settled in noise and tumult. But the most interesting characteristic of all the discussions lies precisely in that lack of philosophic perspective, that sense of proportion, of the relation of things to one another, which seems to me to come so near toward the very essence of sentimentality.

That the world is very much in earnest, no one will deny. I should say it was too much in earnest. It has lost the sense of humor. It is too serious. Simply because it sees things through its emotion. And herein my Washington correspondent was right in saying that sentimentalism was largely "thinking one's feelings", the same as saying that it was "feeling" when one ought to be thinking. And because we see exclusively through our feelings, we are too intense, too excitable, too hasty in jumping at conclusions, and, here is the sad part of it, we are forever going to extremes and thereby making ourselves supremely ridiculous. By losing that sane guidance of reason which preserves in us a sense of philosophic humor, we can see only one thing at a time, utterly oblivious and uncaring of the relation of that thing to all other things. Hence it is that we are cursed with the presence of that peculiar product of modern times, the "reformer", the uplifter, the peeping Puritan, the wild-eyed enthusiast with his pet cure-all for modern ills, people to whom logic and reason and history and tradition and common-sense are an abomination, but whose sole guide and law are their "feelings".

Put it down, if you like, to pessimism. But more than one thinking man is calling the world to-day insane. That is a hard word. But it does really seem as if this wave of hysteria sweeping the world to-day were a sign of mental aberration. This much is certain anyhow, namely, that he who would wish to discuss questions nowadays along the lines of reason and logic is doomed to have a small and most unsympathetic audience. But let your reformer or progressive or so-called rotted mystic come along with his un-rational emotionalism, his audience will be both large and admiring.

Lest this seem too severe an indictment of the present-day man, let the reader stop and reflect, for instance, upon the unmistakably "crazy" views with which the daily press teems. Verily, almost each day, after finishing the morning paper, one feels like rubbing one's eyes and pinching oneself to make sure one is not in dreamland, or wonders to oneself which is crazy, oneself or one's fellow-humans. Day after day it is the same old news of some wild man with a new crazy reform, or some equally irresponsible "prophet" with a new "religion", some progressive legislator with a new "law" to regulate your drink, food, marriage, care of your cat and canary bird, bed-linen, drinking-cup, curfew, a perfect moral pharmacopœia—all flung in your face, crammed down your throat without any thought of the relation of all these things to any other things, your personal rights included; concocted without any regard for past human experience or the lessons of history or the counsel of pure reason; as if their authors were to say literally, as Luther said of Aristotle: "D—n your reason and history and experience; feeling is all we need." Many of us are standing aghast at this veritable debauch of sentiment, wondering whither it will lead, and in the meantime trying to keep our reason safe amidst this babel of sentimentalism.

It is with just such reflections of mingled amusement and pity and humor that I run over a lot of newspaper clippings taken carelessly during the last year. Surely, if Aristotle were alive to-day to read them, he would say the world was crazy, that man had lost his power to reason, his sense of humor, and was a hopeless sentimentalist. What a record of almost infantile imbecility and degenerate emotionalism! I

run over them at random. Let the reader remember that I am not quoting from the publication of some insane asylum, but from the average journals of his time.

Here, for instance, I find the Vice-President of the Illinois Central Railroad ruling against trainmen carrying photos of their wives, sweethearts and babies in their watch-cases, lest doting over them might divert their minds from their business, with consequent grave disaster to the trains in their care. Is not that simply delicious! Wrecks caused, not by improperly installed block systems of signals or generally cheap equipment, but by trainmen gazing too fondly at photos! The pathetic humor of this is divine!

A dispatch from Washington here tells of a couple lately married according to the Eugenic Ritual, the parties thereto having previously obtained in Connecticut the following certificate of health: "To whom it may concern: This will certify that we have this day completed the physical examination of X and find him free from organic disease." Signed, "Dr. ——." Shades of Romeo and Juliet and Miranda and Orlando and Rosalind! Just imagine Juliet leaning over that balcony in dreamy Verona and asking Romeo, as a prelude to a kiss, if he has obtained from his physician a certificate testifying to his freedom from venereal diseases! Enough to make the very gods weep with laughter!

Another idiot, this time from New York, here urges saint-hood upon George Washington—an Episcopalian saint; John Wesley also being nominated for canonization on the side, with a strangely out-of-place recognition of St. Swithin. Well! Why not also throw in the ground-hog and Lincoln and Alexander Dowie? If canonization has so lost its original meaning, why stop at anybody, unless you have sufficient sense of humor to forbear.

Up in Providence, R. I., husbands must evidently be having serious domestic troubles, since we read that a representative in the legislature introduced lately a bill prohibiting women from wearing dresses which button up the back. Being a bachelor, I am manifestly indifferent toward such legislation. But why shouldn't that combination of Draco and Justinian have completed his job by forbidding also hat-pins, ticklers, slit skirts, etc.?—I forbear the rest.

Ah! He has been anticipated—this time by a wise man from out of one of Maryland's own counties. This hitherto unknown Magus has introduced at Annapolis the following: "Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland that it shall be unlawful for any woman, girl or child to wear shoes with high heels, or any hobble skirt, slit skirt, or any kind of skirt or skirts that would seem immodest, or to dance any dance unbecoming to decent society, such as the bunny-hug, turkey-trot, tango and loop-the-loop." By the way, kindly note the ponderous legal distinction between "skirt and skirts" —quite "singular" in its legal discrimination.

And so the merry process of grinding-out kitchen and nursery legislation goes on incessantly. I have mentioned only a few examples. But the reader must, of course, have noted thousands more. Time was when we expected such legislative Peeping Toms down there in woolly Kansas or Texas. But the "East" seems as crazy as they. Yes; it is going on everywhere and all the time, a perfect saturnalia of legislation without rhyme or reason, without any thought of general principles of law, without any concept of the relations of things. Feeling run amuck and expressing itself in sumptuary legislation.

Turning from legislation, how do we find the average man thinking? Same old topsy-turvy fashion of "feeling his thoughts". Here, for instance, I read of a prominent London lady expressing herself to the effect that "the difference between the minds of men and those of animals is not one of kind, but of degree". She is, she proclaims, an "evolutionist" and, "therefore", holds that "In intelligence, especially as regards deduction and combination, they (i. e. the Swiss idiots) are really below the average intelligent dog." This were enough to make even Darwin groan that he ever wrote the *Origin of Species* and to cause even Häckel to smile grimly.

We are not surprised, after this peculiar contribution to "evolution", to read that, up in New York, a woman, who is the President of the Practical Mothers' Association and also a mother of eight children, advises parents to send their children to see a play which even the police thought indecent enough to stop. Along with this we have all the other de-

generate craze about sex. Because some men are vile enough to impart their diseases to their wives, therefore young girls should witness plays like "Damaged Goods", which ought really to be entitled "606" or "Salvarsan". Because some growing youth heed too soon the call of nature, therefore our children should be taught "sex hygiene" by irresponsible public-school teachers, many of them as ignorant as the children, instead of by their parents. Just to-day I read of a man advocating giving to little children for toys naked Cupids and later on, as they grow up, naked Venuses, in order forsooth that they grow accustomed to nakedness by way of art and thus — note the naïve conclusion — "morality will be safeguarded".

In the matter of penal reform, the same. Because prisons do need and have always needed reform, therefore go to the opposite extreme of senile benevolence. If a man is a horse-thief, it must be because something is the matter with his adenoids, not with his conscience, as of old. If he is a pick-pocket, his eyesight is defective. No one is a criminal according to these sentimentalists. Once in a prison, the inmate must be given theatre parties, base-ball games, moving pictures, and so forth. No wonder that out in Wyoming the other day the inmates of one of these model institutions rebelled and murdered some of the officials, varying the entertainment with lynching one of their own number.

Then we have the curious reasoning of Mrs. Pankhurst. Because a woman should have the suffrage, therefore to get it she is justified in not only throwing a hatchet at Mr. Redmond or whipping Mr. Asquith, but—here's the strange part of her psychology — in recklessly burning down a public building built and used by very many men who are actually her sympathizers. Just a madman's way of reasoning.

And as to the fine arts, it is enough to make the ancient bones of Apelles rattle to have a lot of sentimental humans trying to see aught but sheer insanity in a Cubist's "Descending a Staircase", or a modern "Orpheist" laboriously trying to prove that sound and color are the same impressions. When I was a boy, such people would have been tenderly cared for by their anxious relatives. Now they wander at large, simply because their relatives also have gone crazy, and nobody cares whether you are crazy or not.

So it goes on merrily. Anything is true or artistic or moral, because nothing is absolutely true or artistic or moral. The very foundations of civilization are rocking from the senseless sapping of these wild destroyers — a view put forth, by the way, by no less a distinguished writer than M. Guglielmo Ferrero.

Now, I hold all this to be sentimentalism, because they all manifest just those characteristics which we above noted as sentimental — lack of sane thinking, unregulated emotionalism, lack of a sense of humor, and, beneath it all, lack of faith. The very essence of it all seems to consist in a powerlessness to think sanely, induced chiefly, as above said, by a lack of virile faith, itself brought on largely by Protestantism. Yes; I will go to the limit with this proposition and say that, at least here in the United States, the Catholic Church is the one single organization which seems to be sane, to be keeping its head amidst this babel of mental discord; the one organization which has not become the victim of this modern drug known as sentimentalism. My reasons for this will still further illustrate what I mean by that word.

Consider for a moment both her own attitude and that of her people in the face of all these stirrings in the realms of political or moral reform, these new theories of philosophy and art. What surely must strike the observer, as they really seem to do, are her serenity, her firm mental grasp, her lack of hysteria in the face of it all. True, at times she may go perhaps a bit too slowly, certainly too deliberately, for your hasty modern reformer who is so often a victim of his nerves. But always she moves with care, with foresight, after judicious comparison of all facts in the case. She does not jump hysterically at any new reform or fad or scientific theory or social nostrum, but weighs each carefully before accepting or refusing. It is the attitude of a sound mind, of a man of experience and clear brain, not that of an enthusiast whose feelings have run away with his head. There is about her also what one can justly term a good-natured sense of humor. Fierce and uncompromising, though she be, face to face with sin, she has all a mother's tenderness for the sinner and a wise man's prudence in the application of law. Her very silence on questions agitating these modern neurasthenics, so often mis-

taken by them for incapacity or indifference, is, after all, quite often just the sheer good-humored patience of a big and good man with little children. Verily she seems to smile, part in pity, part in fun, at their childish fussing over things long ago settled by her, patiently waiting until they can grow up and understand as she does. So, she lets them play and quarrel, and in the meantime, like a prudent housewife, keeps her home in order. Then, too, with her own children, she gives them full swing in all innocent recreations — since all children need them. Therefore, she refuses to join that sour-faced crew of Puritan Peeping-Toms who are forever seeking to make religion a burden of gloom upon an already heavy-hearted world. It is mental sanity and a sense of humor delightfully combined.

Whence does she get it? Humanly speaking, from her centuries-old experience. After all, these new reforms and theories are not new to her. She has seen all sorts and degrees of reformers; some good, others evil. Peter Damian, St. Bruno, Bernard, Francis, the Fraticelli, Brothers of the Common Life, Vaudois, Peter Canisius, Luther—all who were interested either honestly or dishonestly in just such reforms that now agitate the world. She has tested them all. The problems in philosophy are also to-day not essentially different from those of yesterday. Aquinas, Giordano Bruno, Scotus, Occam practically studied the same problems thought to be new when stated by Spencer. The whole questions of state and church or of political economy or wages and interest and cost of living were also threshed out long ago in their own way when Godfrey de Bouillon was storming Jerusalem or St. Louis of France lay sick and captive at Damietta. And during all this time she was carefully observing and collecting and sifting the good from the erroneous and sublimating her own general principles which would enable her to meet all future contingencies with sane reason. So that, when a new condition does arise, she does not become excited or lose her head and fly to extremes or lose her good humor, as does your typical modern man whose sentimentality makes of him a prey to every passing emotion and fad and theory and whim, be it in politics or religion or art or daily living.

But that very experience itself is linked with a more remote, though none the less intimately connected cause, namely, a superb faith, which, as was noted in the beginning, has so much to do with preserving one from this vice of sentimentality.

The very sense of divine authority residing in her keeps her brain cool and her nerves steady and her eye clear and her heart sober in its impulses. Because she is divine she has been preserved from the mistakes which otherwise would have fallen inevitably to the lot of a mere human institution in days when Cæsar's house was trembling about him and mankind was rebuilding his present abode. This very fact would almost by itself seem to prove her infallibility. Although bad popes hold the reins of government in the tenth century and others prove not much better in the fourteenth and the fifteenth, nevertheless she keeps her head and heart and nerves steady amidst the turmoil out of which modern times were being evolved, out of new political theories of empire and kingdom and republic, out of new systems of philosophy that came and went, out of the ever-shifting economic questions as to gilds and trusts, and the rest, out of the numberless sects springing up like mushrooms from Arius to Luther and his followers. Throughout it all, a strange something has kept her *sane*, preserved her from going to extremes whether in estimating a new system of philosophy or a new political movement or one of those periodically recurring waves of reform or a social change. She may go a bit too slowly at times for the impatient, but in the end she is found serene and right, and has preserved her dignity through it all. There never was the mark of *hysteria* in anything she did. Even when great waves of emotion swept her, as when Bernard preached his Crusades and Francis his new love of the Lady Poverty, or the great Scholastics were absorbing Aristotelian metaphysics, or a Pope Innocent was bringing a world-emperor to his knees—never in any one of those critical times did she show the slightest tendency toward hysteria or sentimentality or exaggeration: but ever went her way superb as a queen accustomed to rule and calm as a Cæsar in his imperial purple.

And yet, this is not because she is cold, for her heart is big and tender and her imagination exquisitely poetic. But neither

her heart nor her phantasy can run away with her reason, and this is precisely why her art and devotion and music and poetry, all the expressions of emotion, are always in such good taste. The *Dies Irae* and *Stabat Mater* and the Gregorian melodies and her Raphaels and Fra Angelicos — all, though the very highest expression of the intensest emotion, all are somehow or other in good taste, modulated, ever held in check by that imperial *sanity* which directs every one of her acts.

I say only a great faith can do a thing like this. A sect can never do it. Sooner or later a sect is bound to lose its head and let its feelings get the better of its reason. A sect is, after all, a human thing. But a big faith is a divine thing gifted with the very wisdom of God Himself. And were the Catholic Church a human thing, it is simply inconceivable that she could have kept so sane amidst all the confusing movements through which she has passed from Peter to Benedict.

And this, then, is why I said above that to Martin Luther is due this modern disease of the soul which, for the want of a better word, I term sentimentalism. He it was who shattered civilization into its "sects" and took away from the human brain that reasonable control which it can get back again only when Protestantism is dead. Until we again become Catholic, i. e. universal in our *habits of thought*, we must forever flounder helplessly in this sea of sentimentality, which is at bottom lack of mental strength, of the power to see life in perspective, to see things in their proper relations, the lack of a broad, divine sense of humor which keeps us from going to extremes or to fads or to hysterical reforms or the other crazy eccentricities we are now cursed with.

This will sound far-fetched at first reading. I grant it. Moreover, I grant that its presentation might on many points be clearer. But the general truth seems to me to stand out bold and clear, namely, that the trail of this modern disease, now so universally attacking the human brain, leads unmistakably back to Wittenberg. Mr. Chesterton has asked, in a volume of essays, "What is wrong with the world?" Well, this much is wrong anyhow; and no one knows it better than Mr. Chesterton, to whose fancy I recommend these *obiter visa*. It is time for him to come out in the open. This is a challenge.

Baltimore, Maryland. LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

THE HALACHOTH OF ST. PAUL.

III. A Hindrance Turned into a Help.

THE discussion of the Law in St. Paul's writings was by no means a purely academic one. He had before his eyes a people: nay, he himself had arisen from that people, who had subverted the purpose of the Law. That purpose was stated clearly before the Law was given on Mt. Sinai: "If therefore you will hear my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my peculiar possession above all people: for all the earth is mine. And you shall be to me a priestly kingdom and a holy nation." [1] These words were said by God, who had announced Himself as "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob",[2] who by this name also had given to Moses his whole commission. But the God of these patriarchs is the God of *the promise* made to Abraham and renewed to the others, "that in him all nations would be blessed". Mosaism, therefore, in all its latitude, was vivified by the promise, just as the book of the Law, the Torah, contained its history. The special legislation of Sinai, the moral, ceremonial and judicial code, was a *means* ordained to dispose the people to preserve faith and hope in the promise by enlightening them on what was hateful and what pleasing to God. But that which was a *means* the Pharisees had made the *end* of all religion. They were a people "of the works of the Law". The Law was their god, but a god, as it were, under control by means of the Halacha. St. Paul corrects this perverse idea when he says: "Why, then, was the Law? It was set because of transgressions, until the seed should come, to whom he made the promise." [3] It contained "the elements" [4] merely of religion. It was "a guide" [5] to lead toward the Gospel. It was not the End. The Law here is regarded from the standpoint of Moses, the accredited Lawgiver. In that light it was not the occasion of transgressions, but, just the reverse, transgressions were the occasion of it. When writing to the Romans, St. Paul has in mind the Law from the standpoint of the Pharisees, and hence this statement

[1] Ex. 19:5, 6.
[2] Ex. 3:6.
[3] Gal. 3:19.
[4] Ib. 4:9.
[5] Ib. 3:19.

is reversed: "The Law entered in that sin might abound." Let us endeavor to find out exactly the mind of the Apostle.

I. St. Paul does not attack the Law in pointing out its proper place, any more than we attack the Bible in giving to the Bible its proper place; much less does he attack the Law when he attacks its perversion. No matter how much Catholics may do for the Bible, they are called and ever will be called anti-Biblical by those who look upon the Bible as a system of religion. But when Catholics oppose the Bible under this aspect, they oppose private judgment, which is the formal part of such religion; and similarly St. Paul, in opposing the Law, as the religion of the Pharisees, was really opposing the Halacha, the formal part of their religion. He upheld "the Law and the prophets",[6] just as we uphold the Bible and the Church. What he argued against was the Law and the self-appointed Scribes. Certain expressions seem to show that in the course of his writings he has the Pharisees very much in mind:

(1) Where he says "those of the circumcision", we know that he is talking of Jews contrasted with Gentiles. The expression used to signify Gentiles shows that it was long in vogue. Does it not seem, when he says "those of the works" [7] and "those of the Law",[8] that he is talking of the Pharisees, as they made their whole religion a religion of works of the Law, and that these expressions too might have been designations long in vogue? He never applies either of these terms to Christian Jews. Likewise, when he speaks of "Jewish fables and commandments of men",[9] "through the Law the scrutiny of sin",[10] "the handwriting by decrees",[11] "the law of commandments by decrees",[12] "why do you yet decree?" [13] "the tradition of men" [14]—if he does not mean the Halacha, he certainly accurately describes it, and he does not describe accurately anything else.

(2) Furthermore, I think it can be shown that those who took an oath "neither to eat nor drink till they had slain Paul" [15] were Pharisees. Did they have the same animosity

[6] Rom. 3:21.
[7] Gal. 2:16.
[8] Rom. 3:19.
[9] Tit. 1:14.
[10] Rom. 3:20.
[11] Colos. 2:14.
[12] Ephes. 2:15.
[13] Colos. 2:20.
[14] Colos. 2:8.
[15] Acts 23:12.

against him that he had against Stephen, and for the same reason, because he spoke "against the traditions which Moses delivered unto us",[16] namely, the Halacha? If they had, then the burden of his controversial preaching, reflected in his writing, was against Pharisaism. But above all, in Romans 2:17, omitting for the present his description, I think that his mind is revealed by a quotation from the Halacha itself. I refer to the famous words: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse. For it is written: *Cursed is every one that abideth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them.*" [17] A note in our Bibles tells us that these words refer to verse 26, chapter 27, of the Mosaic book of Deuteronomy.

II. Let us examine this text, which, as we maintain, is the first of the Halachoth of St. Paul.

(1) This text has a great historical interest, for upon it both Luther and Calvin founded their erroneous systems. Certainly, were the word Law to be taken to signify Mosaism in all its latitude, their arguments would be disconcerting. Luther's argument, as reported by Denifle, was this: "It is well known," Luther says, "what the works of the Law are; they are the highest and most beautiful virtues. Now, do these contribute to justification? No, says St. Paul." Luther, consequently, rejects all virtuous actions, and builds his system of justification on fiduciary faith alone. Grisar tells us how proud Luther was of his commentary on Galatians [18] and reports Melanchthon as saying of it: "It is the thread of Theseus, wherewith to rove through the labyrinths of Biblical science." He tells us also that later Protestants regarded it as "the most significant of Luther's scientific dogmatic works."

Calvin also founded his system on this text. After giving the text as a major proposition, he places the minor. "But it is impossible to abide in all things which are written in the Law." Therefore, he concludes, God's election is the sole cause of salvation.

We see at once that, if this text is only a decree of the Halacha and is quoted by St. Paul to show the bondage of

[16] Acts 6:14. [17] Gal. 3:10.

[18] Vol. I, p. 249, *Luther:* "Epistola ad Galatas ist mein Epistola, der ich mich vertraut habe; meine Kethe von Bora."

Pharisaism on the showing of the Pharisees themselves, both these systems, as far as they get support from this text, are ridiculous. Instead of being built upon God's Word, they are built upon a Pharisaic perversion of God's Word. There would be grim humor in the situation if it were to turn out that St. Paul, who is regarded as the champion of Protestantism, was combating the Protestant spirit all his life, and that not merely by implication but by the most explicit terms.

(2) In the next place, let us look at the reference to Deuteronomy 27:26. The Anglican Bishop J. B. Lightfoot says truly that "this passage is the closing sentence of the curses pronounced on Mt. Ebal and, as it were, a summary of the whole". He tells us furthermore that St. Paul's rendering of the text of Deuteronomy is different from the Hebrew original and from the Samaritan, Greek, and Syriac versions. In our translation of the Septuagint this verse of Deuteronomy reads thus: "Cursed be he that abideth not in the words of this law and fulfilleth them not in work." One sees at a glance that there is an enormous difference between "abideth not in the words of this law" (a particular law of eleven verses besides this summary) and St. Paul's text: "abideth not in all the words written in this book". Yet Lightfoot makes the assertion: "'For words of this law' *a slight modification* is introduced by St. Paul, that the sentence may explain itself." "*A slight modification*", indeed! A whole book and all the things in it, for a few verses! It is assertions like this, which I find here and there in commentaries, that excite my amazement.

III. But what do Catholics say?

(1) St. Thomas, in his commentary on this verse, says: "As many as are of the works of the Law, that is, as many as confide in the works of the Law and think that they are justified through them, are under a curse. To be in the works of the law is to confide and put one's hope in them." Now who were these persons who put all their hopes in the works of the Law? Not the Apostles and the four thousand under James, who were true Christians, although they sincerely reverenced the ancient rites, as one reverences the corpse of some dear one departed; not the saints of the Old Testament, who, according to St. Paul, were approved by the testimony of faith;

not the Sadducees, who formed rather a caste than a religion. There remain only the Pharisees, unless we say that St. Paul was combating not real adversaries but an abstraction. What St. Thomas says further, that "we are justified only by the habit of faith, not acquired but infused and perfected by charity," is all very true. In fact, as stated before, the traditional doctrine of Grace is always given accurately. But is this the place for it? When he says furthermore, "that as many as seek to be justified by works are under a curse because by works sins are not taken away", he gives a meaning of the expression "to be under a curse", but certainly not the full meaning. It looks as if he were writing theology, not commentary, and that here he is missing an important clue.[19]

(2) Cornelius à Lapide, writing on this text, says that St. Paul is speaking of the precepts of the Decalogue. He tells us "to look up Chapter 27 of Deuteronomy and that we shall find that it is so". We looked up this chapter and found that it is not so. The Decalogue was given by God on Mount Sinai; this law was given by "Moses with the ancients of Israel" on Mount Ebal forty years afterward. Contrasted with all other ordinances, it is called "this law", given on "this day", and it deals with those excesses on account of which the heathen were to be exterminated, and against which the Israelites were to be warned in the strongest possible terms. If they fell into these crimes, they would be punished like the heathen. This was the concise meaning of the curse. Of course an excess cannot be committed without breaking some commandment. In order that they might keep the warning in mind, the Israelites were commanded, as soon as they had passed the Jordan, to erect an altar and plaster it so that a writing containing the twelve curses could be placed thereon. What has all this to do with the Decalogue, which treats of sin under general heads, not of particular excesses? The other Catholic commentators whom I have seen, take pretty much the same view; some say that one code, some say that another, some say that all three are meant by the "Law".

[19] The same remark applies to the comments which he makes on the texts which we are discussing, which comments are woven into his treatise on the Old Law and the Law of the Gospel. *Summa*. I IIae QQ. 98-108. They are theological comments on the supposition that the exact and only meaning of the text has been attained: they do not close all discussion.

IV. But no matter what interpretation we give to this Law "of Moses with the ancients", St. Paul as a matter of fact does not quote it. His quotation is: "Cursed is the man who abideth not in all things written in the book of the Law". He says, "It is written," and, as he quotes it, it is *not* written in Scripture. Therefore it must be written elsewhere, and where else except in the Halacha?

(1) There is the strongest presumptive evidence in favor of this contention. In fact, this sentence expressed the whole spirit of Pharisaism. The first Mischna reports the saying attributed to the Great Synagogue: "Erect safeguards for the Law." [20] This injunction was the whole charter of Pharisees, just as "Search the Scriptures" is the whole charter of Protestants. By the one and the other, self-appointed laymen assumed them and assume now unlimited dictatorial powers in divine things. The Scriptural proof for either contention is of the flimsiest. The Pharisees derived their proof from the alleged example of Moses. The latter was commanded by God: "Go unto the people and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow." [21] Moses went to the people and said: "Be ready against the third day." The Scribes translated this expression thus: "Prepare yourselves for three days." Thus did Moses erect a safeguard for the command of God. For if the people would be purified by two days' preparation, *a fortiori* they would be purified by a preparation of three days. Hence in imitation of this alleged safeguard of Moses, the whole legislation of Pharisaism was a legislation of precautionary measures. Precautions were enacted for the sake of precautions, until the whole became an insupportable burden. Let us look at a few so as to grasp what was the reality which St. Paul had before him when he reprobated in divine things man-made laws: "Be not made the bondslaves of men." [22]

"Keep the Sabbath holy" was the divine injunction. Therefore, as a safeguard, on the Sabbath a woman should not look in a mirror: she might see a gray hair and pluck it out; one should not go out with ornaments: they might be taken off, and carried; one should not go out with false teeth: they might fall out and be lifted; one could not put out a fire

[20] Tract. Aboth, p. 7.
[21] Ex. 19: 10.
[22] 1 Cor. 7: 23.

or leave the door open and let the wind blow it out: it would be work. The evening before, the tailor should not go out with his needle, the scribe with his pen, the carpenter with his rule; he might be overtaken by dusk, the beginning of the Sabbath, carrying something.[23] Again, on the day of Atonement, it was prescribed in the Law, the high priest at the beginning of the ceremony should "bathe his flesh". The Pharisees insisted that as a safeguard he should bathe five times and wash his hands and feet ten times. They insisted as a further safeguard, that every time he bathed he should dive. They had so many prescriptions about the putting in of "the handful of incense" on that day that it is a mystery how he ever got the incense into the thurible. This was admitted to be a most difficult ceremony.[24] When Haman came across Mordecai talking with several elders, at a time when there was a decree abroad to destroy all Jews of the realm, he asked Mordecai what they were discussing. He answered, "the handful of incense".[25] Pharisees and Sadducees at times, on the question whether incense should be put in before or after the high priest entered the Holy of Holies, got into a bloody brawl. When the high priest was on his way to the Temple to prepare for the Day of Atonement, the heads of the Pharisaic colleges stood solemn sentinels at the corners of the street, solemnly asking a remembrance; a bodyguard of Pharisees accompanied him; and for seven days put him through the ceremonies. When the day was over, he was accustomed to gather his friends about him at a banquet and rejoice that he had come through the day alive. Again, any vessel that touched an unclean thing, say a dead animal, was unclean. What was the safeguard? The air is a medium of communication. Therefore any vessel that was not as flat as a stove lid, in the vicinity of an unclean thing became unclean. The smallest rim would make the vessel a container of air. Hence infinite prescriptions. Thus it is from one end of the legislation to the other, as we know it now, and in all probability we have only the best of it. Now all this legislation was enforced under various penalties, and the penalties were either

[23] See Tract Sabbath, *passim*.

[24] See Tract Yomah, p. 70.

[25] Tract Magilla, p. 41.

directly or indirectly from God. So true was this held to be that different calamities, such as death in childbirth, a fall, a famine, a pestilence, were attributed to the infractions of this or that law.[26] Because the blind man to whom Jesus gave sight was born blind, the Pharisees said to him: "Thou wast wholly born in sins". To understand the *milieu* of the Gospels, it is almost imperative to be familiar with the Talmud. From it we gather that it was literally true that every Pharisee was under a curse to abide by all things written in the book of the Law.

(3) We not only find this spirit of extending the laws indefinitely, but we have a singularly striking parallel example of the extension of a decree regarding a *few* verses for one time to a decree embracing *all* the verses of the book of the Law for all time. The command of Moses to make for a special occasion a copy of the hymn given in the same book of Deuteronomy, chapter 32, was magnified into a command that every Israelite copy or have copied for himself an exemplar of the whole Pentateuch, and, as if this were not magnification enough, the exemplar had to be made under special regulations as to parchment, ink, quill, lettering, spacing, and everything else conceivable. The spirit of it all is seen in that saying attributed to Rabbi Ismael: "My son, be careful in thy work, as it is a heavenly work, lest thou err in omitting or adding one iota, and so cause the destruction of the whole world."[27]

(4) But there is more than presumption: there is almost direct testimony that our text is a Halacha. A man could not "abide in all things written in the book of the Law and do them", unless he knew all things written. Hence Hillel, the grandfather of St. Paul's teacher, said: "The poor can never fear sin; the ignorant can never truly be pious."[28] And in the Gospel of St. John 7:49, it is precisely the Pharisees who say: "This multitude that knoweth not the Law are accursed." When we take note of whom this was said, and why it was said, and by whom it was said, we conclude that the quotation of St. Paul was undoubtedly a Halacha in vogue in his time.

[26] See *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Pentateuch.
[27] Tract, Er. 130.
[28] Aboth, p. 60.

It was deduced from the aforesaid Biblical text according to the fifth rule of Hillel—" a general from a particular."

V. Now, since St. Paul quotes Greek poets, there will be no difficulty in admitting that he could quote the Halacha of the Pharisees. He certainly quoted a Halacha in Colossians (2:21),[29] but did he quote a Halacha here? Two objections may be raised. First, he says, " It is written;" which is his customary way of introducing Scripture; therefore the saying is Scripture. Secondly, he says, " It is written;" but the Halacha was not written; therefore it is not a Halacha.

It is granted at once that St. Paul *ordinarily* prefaces his quotations from Scripture with these or similar words. But, small as is the volume of his writings, there is one other case[30] in which he has, " Wherefore it (Scripture) says," and the saying cannot be found. St. Jerome, having searched for it everywhere in the known Scriptures in vain, concluded that St. Paul was quoting from an apocryphal work. But the Halacha could be called scripture, if it was written, as well as an apocryphal work. Besides, the Rabbis were accustomed to adduce a mutilated text with the words " it is written ", when, if they produced the whole text, a sense might be gathered different from the one which they were advocating. Rabbi Eleazar said: " The Holy One, blessed be he, has nothing better in the world than the fear of Heaven, for thus it is written: 'And now Israel, what doth the Lord, thy God, require of thee but to fear the Lord thy God?' [See, incidentally, how they inculcated the law of fear!] But the whole verse is: ' and walk in his ways and love him, and serve the Lord with all thy heart, and all thy soul?' "[31] These words show that the fear inculcated in the first part of the sentence is not a slavisih fear, but one compatible with love. Consequently in Pharisaical language " it is written " may mean: " it is deduced from Scripture ". A Boraitha says: "An *a fortiori* conclusion must be considered Biblical ".[32] This disposes of the second objection, since ac-

[29] " Touch not, taste not, handle not." It is well known from the Gospels as well as the Talmud that the law of religious aloofness from the Gentiles was changed by Pharisaic fanaticism into a law of bitter antipathy.

[30] Ephes. 5:14.

[31] Deut. 10:12.

[32] Baba Kama, p. 37.

cording to this the Halacha begins not with the word "cursed" but with the words "it is written". It might also be answered that there was no law against writing the Halachoth, that they were certainly written in great profusion when collected in A. D. 190; that even the Jews attributed the writing of them to a time near the destruction of the Temple, and that St. Paul was writing within a dozen years of this time. But the objector may retort: "'It is written' means Scripture, since the Apostle a little further on says, 'The Scripture hath concluded all under sin.'" But the answer will occur at once that to conclude under sin does not mean to conclude under a curse. In the sense of a sin, a curse for man in this world would be something horrible, which neither God, nor Moses, nor the Church ever contemplated. God cursed the earth and the serpent, but not man; the curses of the Old Law and the anathemas of the Church were always to warn the unwary and to strike terror into the contumacious, that those would flee the danger of, and these would return from, unrighteous ways. It happened that a Christian Corinthian committed one of the eleven crimes anathematized by Moses. St. Paul determined "to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ". These words show the intention of an anathema. But we do not have to guess or infer. St. Paul in Romans 3:9 tells us what Scripture he was wont to employ. "For we have charged both Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin. And it is written: *"There is not any man just"*, etc. Here he quotes several psalms and the prophecy of Isaias. He does not quote this text of Deuteronomy.

We may next proceed to consider the remaining words of the text: "Cursed is every one that abideth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." The text of Deuteronomy (27:26) is: "Cursed be he that abideth not in the words of this law and fulfilleth them not in work." As the wording and the meaning of these two texts differ enormously, it is evident that taken by themselves the two texts are not the same. But may not St. Paul's text be legitimately taken from verse 15 of the following chapter of Deuteronomy: "But if thou wilt not hear the voice of the Lord thy God to keep and to do all His commandments and ceremonies which

I command thee this day, all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee;" and again, verse 58: "If thou wilt not keep and fulfill all the words of this law that are written in this volume, and for his glorious and terrible name, that is, the Lord, thy God: the Lord shall increase thy plagues", etc.? Here we have mention of "commandments and ceremonies" and also the other words "written in this volume". Could not St. Paul incorporate these words in the former sentence, as Lightfoot naïvely said, "that the sentence may explain itself"? Certainly not. The emphasis always falls on those excesses—"the commandments which I command thee *this day*" (verse 1) "to do all his commandments and ceremonies, which I commanded thee *this* day" (verse 15) — the curses were promulgated with appropriate ceremonies "to fulfill all the words of *this law* that are written in this volume," the words were written in the volume indicated, whence in due time they were to be taken for the inscription. It was on account of the excesses that the evils would fall upon Israel; but to obtain the blessings mentioned in the same chapter it was not enough merely to abstain from the crimes of pagans: "The Lord will raise thee up to be a holy people to Himself, as He swore to thee; if thou keep the commandments of the Lord, thy God, and walk in His ways" (verse 8). We see from this that the Decalogue goes with the blessing, not with the curse, and not with the prophecy of "that fearfulness of thy heart, wherewith thou shalt be terrified" (verse 57). The law of fear as well as the curse is excluded from faithful Israel.

Finally, if we consider the argument of St. Paul, that Christ delivered us from the curse of the Law, he could not have meant the aforesaid list of dark and deep crimes mentioned in Deuteronomy. As long as we believe in temporal punishment, that list of curses remains. Besides, St. Paul was fully aware that Israel was under a blessing, not a curse: "Who are Israelites, to whom belong the adoption as of children, and the glory, and the testament, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ, according to the flesh".[33] Among

[33] Rom. 9:4.

these nine blessings are enumerated the testament, the law, and the service of God, the observance of which by the Pharisees had been placed under a curse, and therefore St. Paul says, not "Israel" but "as many as are of the works of the law", that is, Pharisees, "are under a curse". The curse was thought out by themselves to enforce their mandates and build up a wall of animosity to the non-Jew. But Christ rising from the dead had made a laughing-stock of these principalities and powers [34] (the head of the Pharisees was called Nassi or prince), had trampled down the wall of separation between Jew and non-Jew, had quickened the latter and affixed to His Cross the handwriting of death, the Halacha, that was against the former, and had united both in a mystic body with Himself. In other words, the Halacha with all its pretensions of having come with authority from Sinai, spent its force in putting Christ to death; His resurrection proved that its pretensions were vain. All of which goes to show that in the aforesaid text St. Paul was using a dogma not of the Mosaic but of the Pharisaic Law.

VI. The older interpretation, which draws a distinction between works performed with grace and works performed without grace, that is, between a holy and a mere external fulfillment of the Decalogue, and contends that St. Paul's doctrine is against the latter, if not this particular context, but the final object of all St. Paul's teaching be considered, from the nature of the case cannot be wrong. Works, even naturally good works, done without the grace of God *are* valueless. Acquaintanceship with such men as Gamaliel, who spoke beautifully of God and of philanthropy and who were willing to be put to death by Pilate rather than allow idolatrous emblems in the temple, must have caused St. Paul to contemplate the case of naturally good works. He does contemplate this case in its own place. Hence he writes: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels; if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor; and if I should deliver my body to be burned and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." [35] Note well, he does not say "I am accursed". But in writing to the Galatians, who, he thought, had forsaken the Gospel for Phari-

[34] Colos. 2: 15.

[35] 1 Cor. 13.

saism, it is this loathsome thing alone that he is combating. The aforesaid distinction does not fully meet the gravity of his charge nor is it germane to the context. Hence instead of rising out of the context it bends the context to itself.

On the other hand, if this invective is not against the law of Moses, but only against Pharisaism, the difficulties against the Pauline authorship of Hebrews are reduced to a vanishing point; St. Paul's doctrine concerning the Mosaic Law needs no harmonizing with the doctrine of Tradition—it is the doctrine of Tradition; Lutheranism and Calvinism are without foundation; and a great hindrance to our understanding of St. Paul's Epistles is removed, a great help given.

The discussion of the second Halacha of St. Paul will next occupy our attention.

JAMES C. BYRNE.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

THE PROBLEM OF "EXTEMPORE" PREACHING.

ANY person whose experience or position brings him much into contact with embryonic or budding preachers, is bound to notice that perhaps the most vital of their early ambitions concerns itself with what they call "extempore" preaching. The writer has learned from both Monsignor Benson and Monsignor Croke Robinson that by far the most dominant curiosity their fellow-clergy exhibited about their methods of preaching dealt with this point. A novice must naturally contrast his hours of uninspired labor, issuing only in the halting phrases that he brings to the pulpit, with the apparent ease that marks the flowing periods of a talented and experienced preacher: and he asks himself whether it is merely his inexperience that is the hindering cause, or whether it is not his methods of preparation and delivery that are radically at fault.

It would seem useful, therefore, in view of the somewhat confused notions that not a few persons entertain on the whole subject of extempore delivery, and the vexed controversy that in consequence has circled round it, to analyze the various methods of filling up the twenty minutes or half hour that the average sermon occupies. It will be observed that they move in a certain ascending scale.

I. To read or learn by heart some one else's sermon. (The *dishonest* method.)

II. To compose and write out a sermon of our own, word by word, and read it from the manuscript. (The *reading* method.)

III. To write a sermon and deliver it from memory. (The *memorized* method.)

IV. To write a sermon, and, without either learning it by heart or reading it, to use it as a framework of thought, and allow the actual words of delivery to suggest themselves at the time, partly by the manuscript we have written, partly by the inspiration of the moment. (The *written* method.)

V. To write out plan, paragraph, and sentence ideas, and think out, as well as talk through, the words that are to clothe them three or four times, before the sermon is delivered. (The *half-written* method.)

VI. To *think* out plan, paragraph, and sentence ideas, but to write nothing. (The *unwritten* method.)

VII. To choose a subject and trust to unblushing effrontery and fluency for the rest. (The *presumptuous* method.)

These seven methods seem to form a fairly exhaustive résumé and we may proceed to lay down a few general principles on their use.

Of the above seven methods, only two can be declared illegitimate—the first and the last: the first because it is barefaced plagiarism, and the last because it is what we have christened it, a presumptuous method.

Characters vary as individuals. No two men are the same, and it is ridiculous to lay down dogmatic laws on points of this kind. The different methods have each certain advantages, and the attempt to settle the question of who ought to use which by some invariable rule is not only unwise, but has probably made many a stumbling speaker out of a man who might have been a most effective reader, or stupid readers out of men who might have spoken with force and fire. Most authorities on the subject who are not fanatics now recognize that good sermons may be preached by either written or unwritten methods; that if any method is used as it ought to be, the time and trouble involved are about equal; and that whether an individual will succeed best by one or by the other,

is a point which he alone can finally settle, and that principally by experience.

Individuals not only vary from their fellows, but each individual varies from himself at various periods of life, and even at various periods of every year, month, and week in it. So it seems clear that the same method of preaching may not always be suitable for the same man; that almost every man, in some proportion, can usefully employ both; that in reality they help each other—you will write better sermons if you often preach without notes, and you will speak better if you often give yourself the discipline of writing; though the proportion of unwritten sermons to written may well be increased as experience is gained and a man grows older.

It is a very curious fact that many authors confess to a contradiction between their theories and their practice in this matter. Newman, for instance, in his Lecture on University Preaching, advocates strongly the cultivation of speaking without manuscript, yet we are told that he wrote and read practically all his sermons, at all events till long after the date of that lecture. We who never have had the opportunity of hearing his living voice, may be thankful that he did so; otherwise we should not now have the wonderful collection of his sermons that we possess. Robert William Dale, the famous Congregational preacher, makes a naïve confession at the beginning of one of his lectures on preaching. "About the comparative advantages of preaching from a manuscript and preaching extemporaneously, I have some difficulty in speaking. It seems to me that the overwhelming weight of the argument is on the side of extemporaneous preaching; but I very rarely have the courage to go into the pulpit without carrying with me the notes of my sermon, and occasionally I read every sentence from first to last."

Perhaps the reason of this curious inconsistency is that all men, even the greatest men (or rather they more than others, since they have a clearer vision), realize with a certain bitterness the gaps in their own characters. These of course make them what they are; they are the excesses of their good qualities. But they envy the advantages of an opposite character which they see in their neighbors, and ignore the qualities they possess themselves, which are quite incompatible with the

gifts they long for. However this may be, it is evident that such a conflict between theory and practice strongly enforces the point already made, that this matter cannot be settled by dogmatizing and must be left to diligent self-analysis and to individual experience.

So that our next step is to examine the advantages and disadvantages that attach to the various methods we have mentioned, excluding, of course, the first and the last.

The first three of the legitimate methods (II, III, and IV) presume a written sermon as a preliminary, which is utilized in various ways. What are the advantages of this?

It insures a far better chance of care in preparation. Whatever may be said and whatever resolutions may be taken about the duty of preparatory labor for an unwritten sermon, there can be no doubt that the temptation to "scamp" this part of the work is always present and to many people irresistible. If the preacher who feels an ambition for unwritten sermons will make a candid analysis of his motives, he will often, if not generally, discover that he is attracted, not so much by the warmth and liveliness that are their characteristic, as by a dread of the labor involved in writing out every sermon he preaches.

The best part of the care is put in where it is most needed—in the thought and construction of a sermon; and except in the case of phenomenal memories that can retain and call before themselves at a glance the matter of a twenty-minute sermon, it seems certain that no one can afford to ignore the assistance to clearness of thought and construction that writing gives. From Cicero's time down to our own day his maxim for the orator holds, and cannot be urged too strongly on those who are engaged in the work of forming themselves: "Caput est quamplurimum scribere." Potter has a very good word on this subject: "Even supposing the young preacher to possess *in radice* the faculty of speaking well, let him be convinced that he must be content to develop it in the commencement by writing. No matter how brilliant his talent, or keen his intellect, he will not be able to cultivate the one or the other in the most profitable manner, except by a good deal of laborious committing of his conceptions to paper, and a still more laborious working of them out. . . . If to save himself

trouble or through natural disinclination, he shirk this necessary labor in the beginning, no amount of polish or mere facility will ever supply the want of that order, solidity, and clearness, which must be acquired in youth, if ever, and which is only acquired in the manner we have described."

There is a far better chance of accuracy and clearness and self-restraint in a written sermon. Language is a difficult instrument to master, and even the ablest speakers and those who have had most practice cannot command at a moment the simplest and clearest expression of a thought. Indeed with some people a thought will only come in fixed words and the alteration of even one of these worries and confuses them. The man who writes is also spared some of those awful moments that occur to every extemporaneous preacher, when his mind has become an utter blank, or when a wretched piece of folly drops from his lips, that he would give anything to recall the moment it is uttered, but he cannot.

Lastly, and for some the most convincing reason of all, there are certain persons—few comparatively, but still some—who are physically or morally incapable of speaking without a manuscript before them. The class includes not only those whose nervous or physical powers cannot face the strain of concentrated thought that an unwritten sermon demands, but those who are conscious that thought with them is never inspiration, but a process of gradual building up and arrangement; whose first thoughts are never the best; whose faculty of word-summoning lags behind their rate of thought. All these abnormalities generally yield to treatment: they may improve with lapse of time or by well-directed practice; but, for the time being, constant reference to some sort of manuscript is at least a moral necessity for such conditions. And they who have to labor under them may console themselves by the axiom they have so often heard in another application: "Littera scripta manet"—a sermon once written is theirs for ever.

But the other side of the question presents even more important attractions.

The greatest advantage of speaking without a manuscript lies in the greater power it gives of getting into touch with an audience. It is not true that read or memorized sermons are

of necessity dry and dull, any more than it is true that all extemporaneous sermons are vivacious and vigorous. We have all suffered and know how weak and dreary the man who preaches without notes can be. But unless a man has extraordinary force and power, possesses what is called a dominant personality, and at least a touch of the actor's temperament, a manuscript somehow gets between him and his hearers. A read sermon and, almost more, a by-heart sermon, to most people gives the idea of unreality and artificiality. That it certainly need not do so is evident from many illustrious names in the history of Homiletics; Cardinal Newman is the classical example in England. One of the principal reasons why it does so, is that few people have mastered the problems of delivery, of the proper use of the voice; that they do not understand and do not practise the difference of tone, the subtleties of modulation that make words mean what they say and carry conviction. But the fact stands that many, if not most, orators can speak with far more reality, if the words they use are the suggestion of the moment.

An unwritten sermon is more likely to be suited to the capacity of an ordinary audience. If a thought is so wanting in simplicity that it *must* be written for the preacher really to grasp it himself; if it is so unfamiliar to him that without writing it he cannot be certain of expressing it clearly; if it is so subtle that only writing can express its delicacies to his satisfaction, then the chances are that it will be too complicated, or too unfamiliar, or too subtle for a congregation to follow at one hearing, no matter how beautifully it is expressed.

An extempore preacher has an enormous advantage in his power of adapting the expansion of a thought to the way in which he sees it is affecting his audience at the moment of delivery. Every preacher soon discovers that statements which are perfectly clear to himself are not understood by his hearers, and need to be repeated and illustrated and expanded and approached from different points of view. Or contrariwise, that they have lost their interest in a line of thought which he had intended to follow at some length, and if he does not wish to see an ominous row of nodding heads, he must compress and omit and alter his phrasing to suit his change of plan.

Here the man who is not bound down to the set words of a manuscript is in an obviously better position.

That seems a fair and impartial survey of most of the advantages on each side of the question. We have quite ignored among the advantages of unwritten sermons the one which appeals to most young preachers—the lessened amount of time and labor which it is imagined they require. The assertion is simply false: more time and labor are needed for the adequate preparation of an unwritten sermon; and if a man feels the slightest suspicion that this is his motive, one has no hesitation in saying: "*You* must *write* your sermons for the present, and until you can honestly say to yourself [and remember, the temptation to dishonesty here is great] that the motive of lessening your time of preparation does not enter into the problem at all."

Now, after all this analysis, can we lay down a practical working solution of the problem? The usual *via media* seems to present a way of procedure which will give all the advantages of both methods, and yet avoid most of their disadvantages; which will give the practice in writing that all young preachers certainly need, and yet allow them, quietly and without hurry, to work their way to a larger freedom. So to a young preacher who asks for a practical method of sermon preparation, and to the more experienced man who has a suspicion that his labor is not producing the results he might expect, we would give this advice.

For the present *write* all your sermons as though you were going to learn them by heart, but in delivering them in public or to yourself (preaching aloud to yourself is excellent practice, when you cannot get an audience) neither read them nor memorize them, but get into your heads from the study of your written sermon every thought which underlies its text; and preach from these without trying to confine yourself to the original words in which you clothed them. Don't use your manuscript at all in delivery: if you cannot trust your memory, use the plan of your sermon, or enlarge your plan into a paragraph scheme and use this as notes. Don't forget however to put any notes you ever use for a sermon into such form that they appeal to the eye at once. Tabulate, leaving plenty of space; underline; print—anything that will show you at a

glance where you are, and at the same time assist the visual memory; otherwise notes are a hindrance and not a help. Keep to this plan of work until you begin to feel that words are coming easily to you; that if you have grasped a thought you can be fairly certain of having words to express it. This will take some time — for most persons perhaps two years with a sermon every fortnight will not be too long. Then gradually, very gradually, introduce the next method given in our series. Write out plan, paragraph, and even sentence thoughts; think them out and talk them out aloud, three times if not more, before the actual delivery. Further than this you ought not to get during a good many years of your preaching career. Indeed many preachers will find that they can never comfortably advance beyond this stage, and some may have to face the possibility of having to retreat from this position to the greater safety of the written word.

Don't choose complicated or abstruse subjects at the beginning; get hold of the simplest thoughts and words that are compatible with interest—the points you have heard preached a hundred times, the lessons of the Catechism and the Creed; but try to make something original out of them, something of your own. And these first efforts should not be of any length; ten minutes will generally be ample.

You see the advantages of this way of working. You get all the thought, the construction, the accuracy of a written sermon, with the freedom, the reality, the force of expression that belong to the unwritten word gradually taking their places as time and experience allow.

Now all this means work, hard and continued; but surely there never was a man who was able to preach without it. Some have been known to question its necessity, to appeal to the example of the Apostles, to insist that a priest's knowledge of religion is so thorough as to obviate the need of anything like elaborate preparation; yet each of us who have to listen to sermons knows from abundant experience that the work must either be done beforehand, or reserved for the pulpit and the unfortunate victims who are confined before it. The whole attitude is an admirable illustration of "trying it on the dog". Perhaps the old story is worth re-telling.

There was once a young couple who had just commenced housekeeping. They were very wise, so wise that they often wished they could use their superfluous common-sense to line the store cupboard with; generally it was like old Mother Hubbard's—bare. However, when quarter day came round, the cupboard gradually filled up, and then sometimes another difficulty arose. One day a visitor to the house surprised a procession on its way to the back-garden. It consisted of the lady of the house, the cook with a jar of something or other, and the dog. "Hello, what have you got there?" asked the visitor. "Well, that's just the difficulty. We're not quite certain whether it's apricot jelly or soft soap, and so we're just going to try it on the dog!"

Is it fair, is it just, is it ever good form to try your sermons on the dog?

We have said much about methods and their advantages and disadvantages, and yet we have scarcely touched on what is perhaps the crucial point of the whole question. That has been reserved for our last remark, to give it all the force with which it can be urged.

The real question about a sermon is not whether it is extemporaneous when it is delivered, but whether it ever was extemporaneous: whether there ever was a time when, be it written or unwritten, it was put together fresh from a heart and mind talking straight to an audience they had then before them. Surely this is the essential difference between the real sermon and the counterfeit—have they ever known an audience, have they ever felt their hearers? A sermon to be a real sermon must have felt its hearers, must have been conscious of an audience: and whether it attains to this in the quiet of a study or amid the rustle of a crowded church seems in practice to matter little. If the fire has been in it once, it will break out again; if enthusiasm has been stored up there, it will flame again at the moment of delivery. You can feel the truth of this even as you read its printed pages: you know that the man had you in his mind as he wrote, that the sermon talked to men once: it was not an abstract essay; it had something to say to someone, and it said it. So it still speaks to you.

No doubt the best sermons that have ever been preached have been extemporaneous. Still it is probably true that the

number of good sermons preached from a manuscript far exceeds the number that have relied principally on the inspiration of the moment; and the man who can appreciate the bearing of these two facts has gone far to determine which method of preparation is likely to meet his own case.

EDWIN BONNEY.

Ushaw College, England.

THE CASE OF THE BOLLINGER BABY.

ON 17 November, 1915, there was born in Chicago a wee, little bit of humanity—the Bollinger Baby. Dr. H. J. D. Haiselden, who was called in for consultation and later to take charge of the case, refused to perform an operation to save or prolong the life of the child, because he believed that it was doomed to become a physical and mental weakling. The Associated Press sent out an account of the physician's action, and the moral question which was involved; and the Bollinger Baby as a consequence was discussed throughout the land. According to the *Chicago Examiner*: "It was the most far-reaching event that has taken place in the world of science for decades."

It was difficult at first to write accurately upon the question because it was difficult to get the exact facts. At one time Dr. Haiselden was quoted as simply following out the wish of the parents in not operating; and later as not only deciding the fate of the infant but asserting boldly "the right of physicians to snuff out the lives of babies born deformed or with the stigma of imbecility upon them. He not only thinks this the right of physicians but a duty they owe to the future. He believes in the upbuilding of the race by allowing only the fit to survive. . . . Dr. Haiselden stands at the edge of a problem big with the fate of humanity and the future. He comes out openly and advocates death for the defective children, sterilization for imbeciles, and euthanasia for the hopelessly sick or insane."

We have attempted to gather in this short article such information as is authentic, and such as may be serviceable for the clergy in discussing this and similar cases. We get the

facts from two sources—(1) from the story written by Dr. Haiselden for the *Chicago Evening American* and copyrighted by the author; (2) from the verdict of the board of physicians appointed to examine into the case.

DR. HAISELDEN'S ACCOUNT OF THE CONDITION OF THE CHILD.

I found this tiny body cruelly twisted, cruelly malformed, cruelly lacking in essentials. . . . I found it curiously bunched up. It looked as though it were cold—the legs drawn up tightly to the body—the tiny arms pressed closely to its sides. Just the one eye was open; the other lid hung loosely down over the eyeball.

It had a peculiar wailing cry—the pitiful sickly whine of a young kitten—not at all the healthy bawl of a sound and normal child. It was this cry, poor and thin as it was, that later affected me so strongly when it became my duty to judge whether or not this child was worthy, physically and mentally worthy, of life. But now it was only an added argument to convince me that the tiny body that lay before me was outside the pale—that it was hopelessly unfit. . . .

I found the shoulders in a striking position. One of them came up in a peak, reaching beyond the middle of the ear. The other reached almost as high. There was a direct connexion between the scalp and the shoulder on the one side, a fine membrane spreading across and joining the two. . . . One ear was missing. There was no sign of the canal, or even the development of the canal leading to the nerve of hearing. The other ear was badly wrinkled and tightly pressed to the head—not strikingly deformed, however. An infection somewhere in the back of the nose and throat caused a constant discharge.

The main defect discovered in this preliminary examination was the absence of a passageway at the end of the alimentary canal. Here was a condition which if not remedied would necessarily result in death in a short time. And this major defect was in reality to prove a means of escape for Baby Bollinger.

From a peculiar sagging on one side of the face and from making various tests known to the profession, I arrived at the conclusion that there was paralysis in three main nerves on one side of the face. This would naturally lead to the conclusion that the brain was not normal—that if the child lived the brain would be inactive—in short, that the child would be an imbecile all the days of its life. . . .

The X-ray told me other secrets. It showed me that the ribs on the left side were incomplete. They had the appearance of having been caved in. The skull of the child was much like that of the lower animals—the forehead short and slanting—the back of the skull strong and heavy and prominent. The absence of a neck made

this defect still more pronounced. I noted also that the femur, or thigh bones, were abnormally large. This also is the case in lower animals. In fact, the skeleton that lay before me in its hunched and twisted attitude looked like the skeleton of a monkey. It told me plainer than anything that had gone before that this child was in reality a defective—an animal lower than man.

This account was written a week after the death of the child, and consequently after the verdict of the six physicians who were chosen to examine the physical condition of the baby. These physicians were from the teaching staffs of the representative medical schools of Chicago, and each was a specialist. The writer interviewed two of the board and was assured that the committee was unanimous on the following two points: (1) the diagnosis of Dr. Haiselden was positively wrong; in many instances the Doctor showed woeful ignorance of the technicalities of his profession; (2) from every indication the child would have grown to be normal both physically and mentally. We give the main points of the verdict:

The essential malformations of the body of Allan J. Bollinger were: Incomplete intestine; fusion of the two kidneys into one, located on the left side and with a single ureter; absence of the right external ear and of the external auditory canal; a defective development of the skin over the shoulders, especially the right, causing an apparent shortening of the neck; absence of all or part of the coccyx.

The acquired pathological conditions were: Small extradural hemorrhages in the spinal canal; small subpleural hemorrhages; a discharge from the nose, and the coroner's physician reports an area of hemorrhage in the pia mater in the left Sylvian fissure.

We believe that a prompt operation would have prolonged and perhaps saved the life of the child.

We find no evidence from the physical defects that the child would have become mentally or morally defective.

Several of the physical defects might have been improved by plastic operations.

We recommend strongly that in all doubtful cases of this character a consultation of two or more surgeons of known reputation for skill, ethical standing, and broad experience should decide upon the advisability or inadvisability of operative measures.

We believe that the physician's highest duty is to relieve suffering and to save or prolong life.

Miss Catherine Walsh, a Catholic social worker, who baptized the child and pleaded for its life, made the following statement in regard to its physical condition:

> I went to the hospital to beg that the child be taken to its mother. It was condemned to death, and I knew its mother would be its most merciful judge. I found the baby alone in a bare room, absolutely nude, its cheek numb from lying in one position, not paralyzed.
>
> I sent for Dr. Haiselden and pleaded with him not to take the infant's blood on his head.
>
> It was not a monster—that child. It was a beautiful baby. I saw no deformities. I patted him. Both his eyes were open, he waved his little fists and cried lustily. I kissed his forehead. I knew if its mother got her eyes on it she would love it and never permit it to be left to die.

From the above data only one conclusion can be reached—there is no justification for the action of Dr. Haiselden.

In the first place it was not his duty to decide the fate of the child, it mattered not how hopeless its case seemed.

Secondly, he erred professionally. He was ignorant, but "vincibly" ignorant, culpably ignorant. He should have known, and knowing should have operated to save the child's life.

Let us pass on to a hypothetical case. Suppose after due examination by prudent and capable physicians it appears that a child will be a physical weakling, a burden to its parents and to society. Can the parents decide its fate? That is, can they allow the doctors to neglect it, or must they call in physicians to operate? In their own case they would be allowed to refuse an operation that is extraordinary. Can they do so for the child? Here there is a divided opinion. Personally, we believe that where the operation is extraordinary, like the removing of a limb, a parent has the right to refuse in the name of his child just as he would be allowed to refuse in regard to an operation on himself.

My argument is this: A parent's duty to save the life of a child cannot be greater than the duty to save his own life. But in his own case, when there is a question of an extraordinary operation, he has no duty to save his own life; therefore when a child's life can be saved only by an extraordinary operation the parent has no duty to save the child's life.

If the operation is not of a severe nature, the parents have no right to refuse it, even if in the opinion of physicians the child will be a physical weakling.

H. S. SPALDING, S.J.

Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.

A NOTEWORTHY CENTENARY.

ON 25 January, 1916, the Congregation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate completes its first centenary. Just one hundred years ago two French priests, the Abbé Eugene de Mazenod (later Bishop of Marseilles) and the Abbé Tempier, made their abode in an old Carmelite Convent, recovered from its lay possessors, at Aix in Languedoc. There was formed the small community out of which grew the new Congregation. On 1 November, 1818, it held its first General Chapter, when six priests and three young clerics pronounced their vows, and on 17 February, 1826, Pope Leo XII signed the document which gave it canonical existence under the designation of "Missionarii Oblati Sanctissimae et Immaculatae Virginis Mariae".

The history of the Order since those memorable dates is a noble record of magnificent services rendered to the Church. The original idea of forming a small group of home missioners to bring about a religious renovation in a section of the south of France, and repair the ravages which the great Revolution had wrought, was soon to give place to a missionary propaganda that embraces two hemispheres within the scope of its operations. The founder's modest aim at first was the evangelization of the populace of Provence, using their native speech, a blend of French and Italian, as a medium of reaching their understandings and touching their hearts; but when his little flock of fervent preachers became a big family of zealous missioners, at the bidding of the Pope he sent them into the British Isles, Asia, Africa, and America.

The sphere of their indefatigable and fruitful labors now extends from Scotland to the Antipodes, from the St. Lawrence to the Pacific Ocean, and from Lake Superior to the Arctic Circle. Of them it may be truly and literally said,

"their sound hath gone forth unto the ends of the earth and their words unto the end of the world"; for an Oblate bishop includes the North Pole within the circumference of his see. Not only English-speaking races, but African negroes, Cingalese, Red Indians, and Esquimaux have profited by their teaching, learning from them not only the way to heaven but also the arts of civilization. The missioners have devoted themselves with unflagging energy and zeal to the moral and social uplifting of savage tribes, of races emerging from barbarism or semi-barbarism, of half-breeds, of wild Indian nomads, and rude, reckless, and demoralized white settlers in the Northwest, fur-traders, trappers, and *voyageurs*. Father Morice, in the French edition of his history of the Church in the Canadian West, Dom Benôit in his very complete biography of Archbishop Taché, and Miss Katharine Hughes in her Life of Father Lacombe, *The Blackrobe Voyageur,* have told the stirring and edifying story of missionary work in Western Canada in the heroic pioneer times.

That work had to be done, and still is being done in the "thrilling regions of thick-ribbed ice" among the Esquimaux, under the most difficult and trying conditions. They have to overcome almost insurmountable obstacles and to perform long, toilsome, and dangerous journeys; to endure intense cold in an atmosphere where the thermometer sometimes registers fifty degrees below zero; to live isolated from all the conveniences of civilization, with none to converse with but uncivilized or semi-civilized Indians; sometimes to face famine and death from starvation, to live and die far away from home and kindred, like Father Grollier, the Oblate Apostle of the Arctic regions. Even their life under ordinary circumstances is a martyrdom, as Pius IX recognized when he called them "martyrs of the cold". The world applauds, and rightly, those intrepid navigators who have endured the rigors of Arctic or Antarctic climates to reach the Poles; but it takes little or no notice of Catholic missioners in the extreme North, like the Oblates, although they too are extending the boundaries of human knowledge at the risk of their lives; promoting civilization, as well as propagating the Gospel upon which that civilization is based, at the cost of many sufferings and deprivations. When they come back, it is to their convents to

recruit their health and fit themselves for fresh labors, not to be banqueted and "lionized" and have their achievements blazoned in newspapers with flamboyant headlines.

Mgr. de Mazenod held high views of the missionary life. He drew his inspiration from the purest source of Catholic thought and action, the Apostolic age. To his mind the life of the missioner was the reproduction of that perfect life exemplified by the first Apostles. In the preface to his Constitutions he wrote: "There is nothing on earth higher than our vocation. Our direct, principal, and I may say only end, is the very same as our Lord Jesus Christ proposed to Himself in coming into this world; the same end He gave to His Apostles, to whom, without doubt, He taught the most perfect way. Therefore our Congregation recognizes no other founder than Jesus Christ, and no other Fathers than the Apostles."

Filled with the desire of attaining to perfection, he aimed at sanctity and made personal holiness the mainspring, the energizing source of his Order's power and influence in accomplishing its work. "In the name of God, let us be saints!" he would say to his disciples. After the ordination of one of them, Father Guibert (afterward Cardinal Archbishop of Paris), he wrote: "May God bless our religious family! It seems to me that in asking God to send us men like him who has just been ordained, we are asking for all that is needed by us. Holy priests are our riches." He gave expression to similar sentiments after assisting the angelical Father Courtés at his first Mass. Father Tempier described their community life as "the reign of charity in its most lovable form". To one of his first missioners the founder wrote: "Take heed not only to do much good, but to leave behind you the odor of sanctity." Unspiritual priests, whom he regarded as a misfortune for the Church, harmful to the parishes of which they had charge or the religious Congregations to which they belonged, he shunned. He refused to accept as a subject a distinguished priest because he was tinctured with Lamennaisian principles. He never lowered the standard, would never put a high thing on a low ground. To those who appeared to be growing lax he said: "We have taken the resolution to rid ourselves of all who do not aim at perfection."

The new Congregation was another school of saints. Before very long one of the founder's first subjects may be raised to the honors of the altars; for the cause of the beatification of Father Albini, "the Apostle of Corsica", has been formally introduced before the Congregation of Rites. During his life the popular voice proclaimed him a saint. He was regarded as another St. Vincent Ferrer or St. Francis Regis on account of the marvelous success of his missionary labors and his numerous miracles.

All this and more, the rapid development of the Congregation from a local mission into a world-wide apostolate, and the success of his foundations in both hemispheres, the founder attributed to the Blessed Virgin, the heavenly Patroness of the work. It was the outcome of a lifelong devotion to Our Lady. When he entered St. Sulpice he consecrated his future career to her; the humble mission-house at Aix, the birthplace of the Congregation, was placed under her protection, whom he called "the dear Mother of the Mission". After, despite opposition in Rome, he obtained the Papal approval of the Rules, which he ascribed to her intercession, he undertook the restoration of all the ruined sanctuaries of Our Lady in France, which had fallen a prey to the iconoclastic fury of the Revolution. It was during his repeated visits to the sanctuaries of the Blessed Virgin in Rome, that he had the happy inspiration of adopting the name of Oblates of Mary Immaculate, after the primitive titles of "Missioners of Provence" and "Oblates of St. Charles" had been discarded. On a feast of the Assumption he was impressed with the conviction that God meant to do great things in him and through him. In his loving confidence in Our Lady he exclaimed: "It is a sign of predestination to bear the name of Oblate of Mary Immaculate." A few days after he adopted that name he wrote: "Oblates of Mary! Why, the name is a passport for heaven. How is it that we did not think of it sooner? What a glory and what a consolation to be consecrated to Mary in such a special manner! Oblates of Mary! How sweet a name!"

He was Our Lady's chosen champion to uphold and proclaim her unique prerogative, her Immaculate Conception. In the very beginning of his missionary career he used to

close all the public exercises, whether in his chapel at Aix or on missions, with the ejaculation, "Praised be Jesus Christ and Mary ever Immaculate!" repeated three times by all present; while the missioners used to greet each other with the words "Laudetur Jesus Christus", to which the response was made "Et Maria Immaculata". In a General Chapter, it was decreed that all Oblates should wear a special emblem of their consecration to Mary Immaculate, a large white scapular which each professed member receives on the day of his perpetual oblation. In the sanctuary of Notre Dame des Lumières, in the crypt where the miraculous statue of the Blessed Virgin is preserved, the founder blessed his first scapulars of the Immaculate Conception, and invested his brethren therewith; receiving his own from Father Tempier. He loved to recall this. "It was in a celebrated sanctuary of Our Lady," he used often to say, "that we first put on her white habit." When the bishops of the province of Aix assembled in Marseilles, a year after his own installation in that see, it was at his request they petitioned the Holy See for leave to add the word "Immaculate" in the Preface of the Mass of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin. When, on the ever memorable date, 8 December, 1854, Pius IX solemnly promulgated the decree which made belief in the Immaculate Conception an article of faith, Bishop de Mazenod was near the Pontifical throne in St. Peter's. He was enraptured. "I forgot for the moment," he said, "that this world is a place of exile."

A thorough churchman, Cardinal Barnabo said he was "the most Roman of all the French Bishops". As his devotion to Our Lady made him anticipate the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, his devotion to the Church, his unswerving loyalty to its visible head, made him an infallibilist long before Papal Infallibility became *de fide*. "We recognize no other doctor than the Pope," he wrote to a certain priest, "and we conform our ideas to his, even before he speaks dogmatically." He made it a rule for all the members of the Congregation from the beginning to declare on all occasions their belief in the infallibility of the Pope. In 1848 he made public profession before the people of his diocese of his own firm belief in it. A few days before the defi-

nition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception he wrote to Pius IX: "Your Holiness might have decided everything without even consulting the Episcopate." In the Apostolic letters conferring on Bishop de Mazenod the privilege of the sacred pallium, that holy Pontiff wrote: "If the religious lives of the flock constitute the glory of the pastor, praise is assuredly due to our Venerable Brother, Eugene de Mazenod, the present Bishop of Marseilles, whose fulfilment of all the duties of his pastoral charge is so highly meritorious, and who, as the Founder of a Congregation of priests under the title of Oblates of the Blessed Virgin Mary conceived without sin, has a right to partake in the joy which we ourselves feel when seeing his children laboring devotedly in the vineyard of the Lord, with great advantage to souls." It was the intention of Pius IX to have raised him to the Cardinalate, and Leo XII wished to retain him in Rome in a position which would have led directly to his inclusion in the Sacred College; but his death in 1861 prevented the fulfilment of these wishes.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Dublin, Ireland.

Analecta.

S. CONGREGATIO CONCILII.

DUBIA CIRCA TRIUM MISSARUM CELEBRATIONEM IN DIE SOLEMNIS COMMEMORATIONIS OMNIUM FIDELIUM DEFUNCTORUM.

Quum in Constitutione Apostolica *Incruentum altaris* diei x augusti huius anni sub num. 1 data fuerit facultas " omnibus in Ecclesia universa Sacerdotibus, quo die agitur Solemnis Commemoratio omnium fidelium defunctorum, ter Sacrum facere; ea tamen lege, ut unam e tribus Missis cuicumque maluerint applicare et stipem percipere queant; teneantur vero, nulla stipe percepta, applicare alteram Missam in suffragium omnium fidelium defunctorum, tertiam ad mentem Summi Pontificis, quam satis superque declaravimus ", sequentium dubiorum solutio a S. Congregatione Concilii expostulata fuit, nimirum:

I. Ad normam praefatae Constitutionis, in die Solemnis Commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum, possuntne Sacerdotes unam e tribus Missis, quae magis eis placet, cui maluerint applicare et stipem inde percipere, vel primam tantum exclusive?

II. Pro unica Missa quam illa die sacerdotes possunt cui maluerint applicare et stipem inde percipere, possuntne maiorem exigere eleemosynam, vel contenti esse debent eleemosyna ex constitutione synodali, vel consuetudine locali statuta?

III. Potestne sacerdos pro aliis duabus Missis, quas illa die celebrat pro omnibus fidelibus defunctis et ad mentem Pontificis, aliquid accipere ratione laboris, seu incommodi extrinseci, puta si ad aliorum commodum illas celebrare debeat vel loco satis incommodo, puta in aurora vel circa meridiem, in ecclesia vel oratorio rurali, aut coemeterii; vel ne hoc titulo quidem valeat aliquid percipere?

IV. Potestne sacerdos, etiam remoto quovis motivo lucri, alias duas Missas illa die pro suo arbitrio applicare et stipem percipere, et insequentibus diebus applicare per se vel per alium duas Missas, unam pro fidelibus defunctis, alteram ad mentem Pontificis?

Et quatenus negative:

V. Potestne Episcopus poenam suspensionis, etiam latae sententiae, et non faciendi suum stipendium, irrogare in eos qui ita agerent?

Sacra autem Congregatio Concilii ad proposita dubia respondendum censuit prout respondit:

Ad I. *Affirmative* ad primam partem, *negative* ad secundam.

Ad II. *Negative* ad primam partem; *affirmative* ad secundam, excepto casu ultroneae oblationis, vetita tamen non solum petitione, sed etiam quacumque insinuatione ut eleemosyna maior ordinaria a fidelibus offeratur.

Ad III. *Negative* ad primam partem, *affirmative* ad secundam.

Ad IV. *Negative.*

Ad V. *Affirmative.*

Datum Romae, die 15 octobris 1915.

F. Card. Cassetta, *Praefectus.*

L. * S.

O. Giorgi, *Secretarius.*

ROMAN CURIA.

Pontifical Appointments.

14 October, 1915: Mr. James Hicks, of London, England, made Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

16 October: Mgr. James T. O'Farrell, Vicar General of the Diocese of Richmond, Virginia, made Domestic Prelate.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

S. CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL answers five questions regarding the stipend of the three Masses that all priests are now privileged to say on All Souls' Day every year.

ROMAN CURIA announces officially the recent Pontifical appointments.

THREE MASSES ON ALL SOULS' DAY.

Repetition naturally begets tediousness, and tediousness is not conducive to excellence of results.

Forms of prayer are no exception to the rule, and the Bull *Divino afflatu*, which brought about the long-desired reform in the recitation of the Psalter, expressly mentions the avoidance of the tedium growing out of the almost continual iteration of the same comparatively small set of psalms as one of the motives for a redistribution of the Psalter and the assignment of the divisions on principles radically different from those which had hitherto prevailed in the construction of the Divine Office. Now that permission has been granted by the Holy See for the celebration of three Masses on All Souls' Day, the inconvenience of repeating the same identical formulas three times in succession will no doubt be soon and seriously felt.

Of course no one will deny the incomparable beauty of the Requiem Mass as it now stands in the Roman Missal — the simple pathos of its incessant appeal for rest and light which speaks to us with such compelling power of those early days when the life of a Christian often meant little else than the harassment of persecution and the darkness of the prison cell, when it did not please the Wisdom of Divine Providence to vouchsafe to him the triumph of the martyr's palm. We would not, if we could, do away with those venerable formulas which, in the liturgy of the present day, are possibly the only relics extant of the primitive forms of organized liturgical worship as shown in the offertory, which is a true prayer and

is the logical sequence of the "Oremus" which precedes it—the old "Oratio super oblata". This has disappeared from the present form of the liturgy, thus leaving the invitation to prayer uttered by the celebrant bereft of the formal invocation with which it is always associated, an anomaly which today is practically the rule in the construction of our offertories. The Communion also furnishes the only reminiscence in actual use of the original form of that part of the Mass which consisted in the singing of a psalm preceded and followed by an antiphon appropriate to the occasion. For this reason, if for no other, the place of honor should be granted to this form of the proper of the Mass for the Dead, and as such the Roman text ought to be by right attributed to the principal or Solemn Mass for All Souls' Day. This being provided for, there can be no objection, but rather it would seem a most acceptable arrangement, if other texts were appointed for the other two Masses. As a suggestion to those who might be interested in bringing this matter to the attention of the proper authorities, the subjoined texts are presented with a few remarks which may tend to show some reasons for their adoption in the manner proposed. They are taken verbatim from a Gradual of Lyons which reproduces the forms in use in most dioceses of France from about the middle of the seventeenth century until well along in the nineteenth.

The irregularity of the proceedings which originally caused the substitution of diocesan forms for the Roman liturgy by the sole authority of the ordinaries, and the various unfortunate concomitants of that change, need not now cause any apprehension or prejudice against the use of particular texts selected from those liturgies and approved by competent authority. As a matter of fact, many texts have been adopted already from this source and duly authorized by the Sacred Congregation of Rites for local diocesan "propers" and for certain religious communities. With the same sanction, it seems that the following texts should prove acceptable.

The first Mass is the Roman text.

The second Mass is that given in the Lyons Gradual for All Souls' Day, with a slight change which will be noted afterward.

The third Mass is one of the *Missae Quotidianae* from the same source.

I. Missa.

Ut in Missali Romano, In die Commemorationis Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum.

II. Missa.

Ex Missali Lugdunensi, In die Comm. Omn. Fidel. Def.

INTROITUS.

Respice, Domine, in testamentum tuum: ne tradas bestiis animas confitentes tibi, et animas pauperum tuorum ne obliviscaris in finem. Ps. Utquid, Deus, repulisti in finem: iratus est furor tuus super oves pascuae? Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine; et lux perpetua luceat eis.—Respice. . . .

GRADUALE.

Domine omnipotens, Deus Israel, audi nunc orationem mortuorum Israel et filiorum ipsorum qui peccaverunt ante te. V. Noli meminisse iniquitatum patrum nostrorum; sed memento manus tuae et nominis tui in tempore isto: quia tu es Dominus Deus noster.

TRACTUS.

De profundis clamavi ad te, Domine; Domine, exaudi vocem meam. V. Fiant aures tuae intendentes in vocem deprecationis meae. V. Si iniquitates observaveris, Domine: Domine, quis sustinebit. V. Quia apud te propitiatio est, et propter legem tuam sustinui te, Domine.

OFFERTORIUM.

Ad Dominum aspiciam, expectabo Deum salvatorem meum: audiet me Deus: consurgam cum sedero in tenebris; Dominus lux mea est: iram Domini portabo, quoniam peccavi ei; educet me in lucem, videbo justitiam ejus.

COMMUNIO.

Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam; et ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die.

III. Missa.

Ex Missali Lugdunensi in Missis quotidianis Def.

INTROITUS.

Inundaverunt aquae super caput meum: invocavi nomen tuum, Domine, de lacu novissimo: vocem meam audisti; ne avertas aurem tuam a singultu meo et clamoribus. Ps. De profundis clamavi ad te, Domine: Domine, exaudi vocem meam. V. Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine: et lux perpetua luceat eis.—Inundaverunt. . . .

GRADUALE.

Si ambulavero in medio umbrae mortis, non timebo mala, quoniam tu mecum es, Domine. V. Virga tua et baculus tuus, ipsa me consolata sunt.

TRACTUS.

Dominus petra mea et robur meum et Salvator meus. V. Funes inferni circumdederunt me: praevenerunt me laquei mortis. V. In tribulatione mea invocabo Dominum, et ad Deum meum clamabo. V. Et exaudiet de templo suo vocem meam; et clamor meus veniet ad aures ejus.

OFFERTORIUM.

Domine Rex, Deus Abraham, miserere populi tui: ne despicias partem tuam quam redemisti tibi, et propitius esto sorti et funiculo tuo: converte luctum nostrum in gaudium, ut viventes laudemus nomen tuum, Domine.

COMMUNIO.

Convertere, anima mea, in requiem tuam, quia Dominus benefecit tibi: placebo Domino in regione vivorum.

These several propers could be used with the Epistles, Gospels, Collects, Secrets, and Postcommunions, as arranged in the recent decree of the S. Congregation of Rites for the Masses on All Souls' Day. As this decree contemplates the celebration of one Solemn Mass on that day and prescribes for that purpose the Mass "In Commemoratione Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum," it is not imperative that provision be made for the musical setting of the other two Masses. But, as normally every Mass in the Missal demands its corresponding place in the Gradual, and occasions may arise when these Masses would have to be celebrated *modo solemni*, it may not be superfluous to touch upon the question of the chant that might be appropriated to the text.

In the French Graduals from which these Masses are taken, the Introits of all the Requiem Masses are unfortunately mere literal imitations of the Roman Introit.

The objection to such treatment is manifest. However, so far as the second Mass "Respice Domine", is concerned, there is little difficulty, as it reproduces a part of the Introit of the Mass for the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost. That Introit might be used in its entirety with the omission of the phrase

" et judica causam tuam ", which may not be exactly appropriate for the Requiem Mass, and thus the question of a truly Gregorian melody suited to the text would be satisfactorily settled.

The Tract of the same Mass is the De Profundis, which performs the same function in the Mass for Septuagesima Sunday, with only the slight change of " in vocem deprecationis meae " into " in portionem servi tui ", which reading should also be adopted for the Requiem Mass in conformity with the text of the psalms as given throughout the Roman Missal. In the third Mass, the Gradual " Si ambularem " is the same as the one given in the Dominican Missal for the Masses of the Dead. The melody therefore is an ancient one, which obviates the necessity of providing another. The change mentioned as having been made in the second Mass concerns the offertory, which in the original reads: " Fortissimus Judas, facta collatione, duodecim millia drachmas argenti misit Jerosolymam offeri pro peccatis mortuorum sacrificium, bene et religiose de resurrectione cogitans." This is too prosy for any possibility of its being set to music, and accordingly the offertory given has been substituted for it from one of the Missae Quotidianae.

The text of the Offertory of the third Mass: " Domine Rex, Deus Abraham," being in the form of a prayer or invocation, has the advantage of this similarity to the Roman offertory, and therefore it may not be altogether impossible to adapt our present melody to the new text. The same consideration might induce us to interchange in the second Mass the Gradual and the Offertory, since the Gradual " Domine omnipotens, Deus Israel ", because of its invocatory character would preserve throughout the three Masses the peculiar characteristic which is so distinguishing a feature of the " Domine Jesu Christe ", while the text " ad Dominum aspiciam " would seem to be better adapted to be treated musically in the style appropriate to a Gradual. With the exceptions already noted in the case of the Gradual " Si ambularem ", and the Tract " De profundis ", which have proper musical texts in the Dominican and Roman liturgies respectively, the other Graduals and Tracts could then very easily be provided with melodies of the eighth tone so many examples of which abound throughout

the Gradual and Antiphonary. The Communion "Qui manducat meam carnem" of the second Mass is practically identical with the Communion of the ninth Sunday after Pentecost and there seems to be no trouble in using the same musical setting for both.

This arrangement would leave only the Introit "Inundaverunt" and the Communion "Convertere" of the third Mass unprovided for, though the Introit "Circumdederunt" of Septuagesima might perhaps inspire a melody for the "Inundaverunt".

However, the entire question belongs to the province of those whose training and practice have made them experts in the traditional chant of the Church and with them should rest the ultimate decision with regard to the melodic text to be finally adopted. In conclusion, might it not be advisable to extend to the whole church the use of the proper Preface which has already been conceded for various localities?

The text is taken from one of the old Sacramentaries: "Vere dignum" etc. "per Christum Dominum nostrum; In quo nobis Spem beatae resurrectionis concessisti, ut dum naturam contristat certa moriendi conditio fidem consoletur futurae immortalitatis promissio; et, destructa terrestris hujus habitationis domo, aeterna in coelis habitatio comparatur. Et ideo . . . etc."

The writer does not in the least underestimate the objections which the suggested innovation will raise. On the contrary, he was very deeply impressed by the earnest and pathetic words of a learned and pious Benedictine, grown gray in the practice of the liturgy of the Church, whose profound knowledge is equaled only by his deep humility, to whom this article has been submitted for criticism. His deep reverence for and strong attachment to the text of the Requiem Mass were feelingly expressed in his quiet though earnest words and manner which told plainly that any change in this matter would be a keen sorrow to him.

No doubt many of the clergy would be affected in the same way and would view the change as an innovation inimical to the sentiment with which centuries of usage have endowed our Requiem Mass. With hesitation, then, and with all considerateness for the feeling and preferences of others, these

remarks are submitted to the attention of the Reverend Clergy and of those who take a praiseworthy interest in liturgical matters.

VICTOR MENGELLE.

New Orleans, La.

"CASUS CONSCIENTIAE"—A REPLY.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

With reference to the "Casus Conscientiae" proposed in the August, 1915, number of the REVIEW, Ballerini in his edition of Gury (p. 551) proposes and solves the difficulty submitted by "Confessarius". The question proposed by Ballerini is, "Ad quid tenetur possessor bonae fidei, si rem alienam gratuito acceptam alteri vendiderit?" And he replies, "In casu evictionis tenetur emptori damnum rependere, ut in casu precedenti."

The preceding case to which he refers is that in which a man buys a thing from a thief and then sells it to another, and the answer here also, although the thing has been acquired by an onerous contract, is that "in casu evictionis" the vendor is bound to restore the price to the purchaser who has suffered eviction.

And, at page 625, discussing the *res* which pertains to the nature and essence of a contract of sale or "venditio", he states that security against eviction pertains to the *nature* of the contract of sale, and therefore "sine *conditione expressa* venditor rei venditae securitatem praestare debet".

From all of which it is evident that A was bound in strict justice to restore the price of the farm to B. For in the statement of the case the existence of an *express contract* absolving A from the obligation of restitution in case of eviction is not even hinted at.

The question as to interest is not so plain. But since B has a strict right to recover the price of the farm, it is evident that he has a strict right also to compensation for all damages directly accruing from A's *unjust* withholding of the price.

The only difference between A's condition as regards the *damnum emergens* and a *possessor malae fidei ab initio* is that A may claim ignorance of his obligation and may allege that

the moment he was satisfied of the justice of B's claim he made restitution. But B is not to suffer on account of A's ignorance. A should not have entered on an enterprise which he was not capable of discharging and a sufficient knowledge of which B was bound to credit him with, as otherwise B's action would have been immoral *a principio*, which however would not alter A's subsequent obligations to B in the least.

Besides, it is quite gratuitous to accuse B of dishonest motives. He appears to have acted in a purely business manner and, no doubt, in his own mind, gave as much credit to A for business acumen as A is careful to state he credited B with. A is therefore bound *per se* to restore the extraordinary interest.

The continued payment of the extraordinary interest was a direct consequence of A's unjust detention of B's money; consequently *prima facie* he is bound in justice to make satisfaction for it.

The period which intervened between B's eviction and the time when A made restitution is not given, but it does not necessarily follow that A has to pay the extraordinary interest for the whole period. His obligations extend only to *actual damna* and therefore only to the amount of interest actually paid by B.

If the interest was usurious, A should have actual advertence to and knowledge of the straits in which B was placed before he would be bound in conscience to compensate for such interest, but such special advertence and definite knowledge would not be necessary if the interest did not exceed the highest grade of legitimate interest.

The reason for the detention is that, since there are only two sources from which the obligation of restitution may arise, namely an obligation in conscience and a *sententia judicis*, and, since usurious interest is both extraordinary and not sanctioned by municipal law, a clear obligation in conscience must be established before the necessity for restitution urges. Actual advertence, therefore, and positive knowledge of the extraordinary evils which the unjust detention was causing would be necessary before an obligation to restitution could be imposed. *Nil volitum quin precognitum* measures the value of the result of all human efforts, whether for good or

for evil; consequently A is not bound to restore the usurious interest unless he had actual knowledge of the difficulties in which B was placed. But for ordinary *damna*—in this case the highest grade of legitimate interest—no special advertence or definite knowledge would be necessary for establishing an obligation to restitution even *ante sententiam.*

Crolly defines "culpa pure juridica" as "omissio involuntaria diligentiae quam quis adhibere tenetur ad damnum alterius precavendum"; and he further states that it is entirely false to think that this obligation depends entirely for its sanction on municipal law. "Omnino falsum, namque in contractibus et quasi contractibus tenentur ii qui res alienas possident aut negotia aliena peragunt ex ipso jure naturali ad certum gradum diligentiae adhibendum qui gradus ex natura contractus aut negotii definiendus est." A's ignorance therefore of the nature and obligations of the contract he entered into was at least a *culpa juridica* on account of which, according to Crolly, he is bound both in law and in conscience, at least *post sententiam judicis,* to compensate for any losses the latter may have suffered on account of that ignorance.

And since A admits that not only had he no knowledge of his specific obligations arising out of the contract, but that he made no effort to discover them, this negligence of itself is sufficient proof that it was a *culpa theologica* also. For to enter into a contract so doubtful from its very nature in such a state of mind as A describes, was, to say the least, courting disaster.

But the fact that A had nothing to lose and everything to gain by the transaction and that, although in the meantime (after B had paid ten dollars on account) A, as he states, heard the new law of absolute tax titles discussed and "heard opinions (though not legal opinions) expressed that it likely would be set aside by the supreme court as unconstitutional", he still proceeded without seeking legal opinion to the completion of the contract, compels any disinterested witness to a conclusion still more unfavorable to A, viz. that his ignorance was merely *ignorantia affectata.*

In such circumstances, according to Crolly, "quum quis diligentiam debitam voluntarie omittit, lex municipalis quae cogit eum restitutionem facere legem naturalem tantummodo con-

firmat. In his casibus culpa juridica cum culpa theologica conjungitur et, quum conjunguntur, obligatio restitutionis urget *ante omnem sententiam* neque potest damnificator juste cum eo qui damnum passus est litigere nisi aliquod aut juris aut facti dubium existat."

In this case the "dubium facti" refers to the nature and extent of the injuries suffered by B, which must be determined in the manner already stated.

Ballerini's teaching as set forth in the beginning of this argument and Crolly's doctrine on the effect on a contract of sale of ignorance which is both juridical and theological remove all grounds for a "dubium juris". Therefore in the case as stated, A is bound *ante sententian judicis* not only to the capital amount, but to compensate for damages also.

This solution, as is evident from the authority of the theologians quoted, is the plain teaching of theology on the questions of justice involved in the case.

The case itself presents no practical difficulties, as it is proposed and answered in almost every treatise on restitution. But the solution given by Fr. Stanislaus is so erroneous and illogical that it was necessary to quote the authorities mentioned.

He brushes aside absolute justice as a thing of little importance and something never to be sought after in contracts and makes positive law the measure of morality of action, while positive law itself is moral or immoral in so far as it corresponds or differs from the Decalogue, and hence no law can justify an act which is immoral in itself.

Father Stanislaus is right in stating that laws are intended for the regulation of rights. Laws therefore are only secondary, mere helps or aids for the regulation of rights, and consequently when they fail in their object they must be supplemented by the immutable law of the Decalogue.

The contention therefore that absolute justice cannot be attained need not be disputed, as in human affairs absolute perfection is impossible. But the statement that absolute justice must not be sought after, and that when a positive discrepancy occurs restitution must not be made, is absolutely erroneous.

It is this effort to substitute law for justice that is at the root of all the immorality of the present day. Justice is im-

mutable, but laws are constantly changing. Remove therefore the obligation of seeking after absolute justice and you leave an open door for greed, avarice, and chicanery; so much so that even apparently good men, impelled by the instinct of self-preservation, become so oblivious of the dictates of justice that they not only mutely assent to, but often positively approve of, most iniquitous laws.

The statement therefore that there is nothing like strict justice between individuals is misleading and, at most, signifies that in human affairs there must always be *small* discrepancies, which in most instances, as in contracts, are automatically righted. But if the discrepancies are grave, there is the same obligation to restitution as in any other instance when a man finds himself an unjust possessor of another's property.

Good laws should indicate absolute justice so successfully that, generally speaking, a conscientious man may rest satisfied with the mere fulfilment of the law. But this satisfaction does not arise from the mere fact of having fulfilled the law, but from the consciousness of having satisfied justice.

It is not so much what Father Stanislaus says in his solution of the case that avails for good or for evil, as the spirit it represents of a total disregard for absolute justice. There was more social virtue in the action of Robin Hood and the Irish Reparees who took by force from the rich and gave to the poor than in the most pharisaical observance of law with the sole object of overreaching justice. It is the desire for justice and the consciousness of its superiority over all customs and forms, whether legal or otherwise, that tells. And this truth, though in a manner wholly unjustifiable, these outlaws helped to inculcate, and in so far society is their debtor.

There is nothing new in this heresy; it is the hypocrisy of the Pharisees which our Lord condemned—the fulfilling of the letter but not the spirit of the law; and the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth. Hypocrisy therefore may be defined to be the substitution of law for justice, and, as honesty is conformity to law, honesty in the pharisaical sense, if not opposed to justice, is entirely oblivious of it. In this sense we could with Father Stanislaus call A an honest man, though he never restored the price of the farm to B.

Given such principles and bearing in mind the abiding and uncontrollable nature of the instinct of self-preservation, the present condition of society becomes intelligible. This heresy has got a literature of its own which, as might be expected, is a congeries of vague generalities. The phrase, for instance, "all things being relative in value and appreciation", like every other aphorism, may mean anything or nothing according to the context in which it is found. As used by Father Stanislaus it has no meaning and no use except to confuse the issue. For the relation in value and appreciation between five hundred dollars (the price of the farm) and nothing is self-evident. The proposition also in which this phrase occurs is equally obscure and indefinite. Everybody, it is true, acknowledges the right of the State to make laws for the regulation of rights and the transfer of rights, but no one acknowledges the right of the State to extinguish rights, except through its *altum dominium,* and then only for a just cause and after having made equitable compensation.

The fallacy of the phrase, "there is nothing like absolute justice in transactions between individuals", has already been shown; and it is entirely out of place as the minor member of the thesis. Substantial justice, at least, is necessary in transactions between individuals; therefore when the laws fail to secure the degree of justice, they fail in their *raison d'être;* they fall short of their purpose and must be either entirely repudiated, as in the case of laws which are substantially immoral, or, where the defect is purely negative, be supplemented by the Decalogue.

And the whole syllogism, namely, "Everybody acknowledges the right of the State to pass laws for the regulation of rights and the transfer of rights, and as there is nothing like absolute justice in transactions between individuals, all things being relative in value and appreciation, we are to be guided by the laws of the country in these matters", is both faulty and bad. For even though absolute justice were possible in transactions between individuals, laws would still be necessary for the regulation of rights, and the transfer of rights; therefore the deduction is both unmeaning and unwarrantable.

The next statement of Fr. Stanislaus, namely, "It is unfortunate that laws are passed that are so soon after annulled by

the supreme court, as in this instance regarding the value of tax titles; but there is no reason to blame A for it and hold him responsible for the loss that the change of laws caused", shows that I have not exaggerated in the smallest degree, in my analysis of Fr. Stanislaus's conception of justice or his interpretation of law.

In this statement also, in his zeal for the law, he is most unjust to the State, for it is not to be supposed that a State which compelled the original owner to return to B the four years tax title rent paid by A, during his tenure of the farm, would allow A to hold with impunity the price of the farm which he received from B under exactly analogous circumstances.

And the last argument is also illogical and misleading, viz. "the very fact that B did not dare to go to court because of having no valid reason to hold A responsible for the loss of his money is sufficient proof that A was not bound in justice to refund the money." It is illogical because it assumes just what was required to be proved, namely, whether B had valid reasons on his side or not. And it is misleading, because it openly suggests that there can be no obligation in conscience to restitution except *post sententiam judicis;* which is evidently what the phrase, "we are to be guided by the laws of the country in these matters", is intended to convey, and therefore anyone who does not fight his cause in a court of law and secure a judgment, thereby forfeits all rights in justice.

THEOLOGUS.

PROPRIETY IN THE USE OF WORDS ONCE MORE.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

There is another phase of this subject that I wish to deal with. The writer[1] of "Cell Life in Soulless Tissue" cites St. Paul's admonition to "hold the form of sound words"; and, he adds, "in case of translations, the sound sense". This is said apropos of the principle of the schoolmen "Formae educuntur de potentia materiae". I have held the form of sound words. His translation, or paraphrase, empties the

[1] REVIEW, Nov., p. 565.

aphorism of its meaning. He begins by telling us that the attribute it assigns to matter is of a negative kind only. Whatever meaning you put upon "potentia" here, you cannot make it signify "impotence", or simple "possibility". Impotence is lack of potency, and possibility is mere non-repugnance to being. The word "potentia", in the formula of the schoolmen, means a great deal more than that. It is properly rendered "potency" or "potentiality", the former commonly in an active, the latter in a passive sense. It may be defined as the inherent capability of a thing to take on a new mode of existence.

Let me illustrate. A block of marble is in (passive) potency to become a statue. And it is proper to say that the sculptor educes the form of the statue from the potency of the marble, because it is latent there. On the other hand, water or air is not in potency to become a statue, and, in accordance with the laws of nature, a statue can never be educed thence. Again, hydrogen and oxygen are in potency to become water, and a given agency, say, a current of electricity, may educe from these gases the substantial form of water. But no other simple elements in nature have the inherent capability of becoming water; hence its chemical symbol is H_2O. Take one more instance. By rubbing two sticks together you produce fire, which is properly said to be elicited or educed from the potency of the wood. Wood is capable of taking fire.

What, then, of life? Can life be educed from the potency of matter? That depends on the agency, and on the kind of life. No agent, not even God Himself, can educe spiritual life, spirit, such as an angel or the soul of man, from matter; for such life is not within the potency of matter. Spirit excludes matter as absolutely as light excludes darkness. But organic life, vegetable and sentient life, life in plant and brute beast, may be educed from matter by the agency of the Creator. God did this once, in the first institution of things, and what He did once He could do now. I say "could", not that He does, or will, do it.

All life on earth, save the soul of man alone, was first educed from the potency of the elements by the Word of God. The soul of man He made out of nothing, i. e. without pre-existing material; the vital principles of animals and plants He drew

forth out of pre-existing material. I have called this operation, as distinguished from creation, "creative eduction from the potency of matter". The expression is correct, and in accordance with the use of the schools. The writer puts his own gloss on the scholastic formula, explaining it in this wise: "Forms presuppose in matter an appetency for, and a capacity to retain them, and are produced in, or induced into, matter *by an efficient agency* whenever these dispositions are at hand" (See REVIEW, Nov., p. 566). An authentic explanation is furnished by no less an authority than St. Thomas himself, in these words: "That which is made is not the form, but the composite, which is made out of matter, forasmuch as matter is in potency to the composite itself by virtue of its being in potency to the form. *For this reason it is not proper to say that the form is produced in the matter, but rather that it is educed from the potency of the matter.*"[2] The italics are mine.

The elements, both passive and active, of the world are spoken of by St. Augustine, and after him by St. Thomas, as "seminal causes". "In the first institution of things by the work of creation", the latter observes, "plants and animals did not exist in act, but only in potency, so that they might be produced from the elements by the power of the Word".[3] The composite beings, viz., plants and animals, are said to be "produced", because it is these that are the term of the creative act ("creative" = "of or pertaining to creation", "the act by which the Creator Himself fashioned things out of matter"); it is these that exist. On the other hand, as we gather from the words of the saint himself, life in plant and animal is properly said to be "educed" from the potency of the elements, "forasmuch as matter is in potency to the composite itself by virtue of its being in potency to the form", in this case, the principle of life.

Natural reason itself would lead us to think that organic life was first educed from the potency of the elements because it is evermore maintained from the same source. That wonderful process of nutrition whereby the living organism takes

[2] De Pot., q. 3, a. 8.
[3] Ib., q. 4, a. 2.

up into itself and assimilates food, what is it but a sucking-up of life from the potency of matter—not life without pre-existing life, but life renewed over and over again? As the conservation of a thing is the continued creation of it, so this perennial renewal of life may justly be regarded as the continued eduction of it from the seminal causes that are sown throughout the material universe.

One word in conclusion. There is no limit to the power of God, but there is a limit to the possibility of things. The writer declares that God could, by a miracle, turn a stone into an angel or a man. There is absolutely but one way in which an angel or the soul of man can begin to be, and that is by creation out of nothing—not by transmutation of any pre-existing thing.

✠ ALEXANDER MACDONALD,
Bishop of Victoria.

P. S. In the December number, at page 684, fourth line from foot, the word *not* should read *but.*

IS ST. COLUMBAN FORGOTTEN?

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In Metlake's *Life of St. Columban*, at page 243, we read: "In his native land Columban's name, like that of all the other missionaries and pilgrims to the Continent, was for many centuries forgotten; it occurs neither in the secular annals nor in the catalogues of the saints." That this sweeping assertion is not altogether true, even as far as St. Columban is concerned, is evident from the following entry in the twelfth-century Irish Martyrology of Maelmuire O'Gorman, under 21 November: "Columban nocaraimm", that is, Modern Irish, "Columbán a charaim", Columban whom I love. The gloss, "Abb robhui is in Ettail, An Abbot who was in Italy," and the date, 21 November, make it clear that the reference is to St. Columban of Luxeuil and Bobbio.

JOHN J. O'GORMAN.

Ottawa, Canada.

ANENT THE "MEXICAN PROPHECY" OF 1860.

In the October number of the REVIEW a reader commented on an editorial of *Extension Magazine* entitled "Prophecies that are coming true" and asked for authentic information as to the date, place, and persons quoted in the editorial. The following is the answer of the editor of *Extension Magazine*:

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The editor of *Extension Magazine* was not in the United States when a letter from "Inquirer", asking for information concerning a certain Mexican "prophecy", was printed in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. He now authorizes me to forward you what information we possess at this office. We have here a copy of the alleged prophecy printed by Jose L. Vallejo, Av. Isabella Catolica, 20, Mexico City, containing also the following information:

The "prophecy" was made in October 1860, in the state of Mexico. It was printed in a book called, "Compilacion de datos historicos, sobre algunas advocaciones con que es venerada la Santisima Virgen Maria en la Iglesia Mexicana". The author is Vicente de P. Andrade, Canon of the Basilica of Santa Maria de Guadalupe. The city of publication was Mexico. Further information as to date is contained in the following: "Talleres tipograficos de El Tiempo, premero de Mesones num. 18.—1904—Apendice—Pag. 152." In addition to this, the "prophecy" was published in El Tiempo in the 21st vol., No. 7,074, which corresponds to Sunday, the 15th of May, 1904, 1st page, 1st column. It goes without saying that it is unlikely that a file of El Tiempo could be found outside of Mexico, as communications with Mexico are rather difficult at present. Neither is it possible to secure a copy of Canon Andrade's book.

All of the above information could have been had by "Inquirer" through addressing a letter directly to *Extension;* but, of course, in that case he would have been obliged to give his name. Those who have read the editorial in *Extension*, already know that the writer certainly did not leave the impression upon readers that he was upholding "fake prophecies". On the contrary, he said: "We pass no judgment, we make no act of faith in revelations and prophecies that have not the sanction of the Church." The editorial merely called attention to the fact that the alleged prophecy was printed long before the European war, long before the present trouble in Mexico, and long before there was any thought of a Pope named "Benedict XV". The word "facts" very plainly referred to the events of the day, which, on the face of them, seemed to be a fulfillment of the so-called "prophecies". The editorial writer was con-

vinced on the testimony of some of the Mexican Bishops themselves that Canon Andrade's book of 1914 had really printed the old tradition of 1860.

Faithfully yours,

S. A. BALDUS, *Mgr. Ed.*

PECULIAR PREJUDICE OF ANTI-PROHIBITION.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The undersigned begs leave to invoke the calm, unprejudiced verdict of the priests of the country regarding the vexatious problem of resisting the bold and defiant power of the liquor traffic. The Rev. Lucian Johnston in the October number of the REVIEW, and the Rev. Father McMillan in the November number, do not, I trust, voice the sentiments of the devoted priests of this country on the liquor problem. Both seem to have become panic-stricken over the dangers of Prohibition. Neither of them takes the trouble to define for your readers just what we are to understand by Prohibition. The writer has had some experience during the past forty years in trying to minimize the evils of the liquor business. He has met many fanatics on all sides of the vexatious problem. The most unreasonable fanatics, however, that he has encountered anywhere are prejudiced champions of anti-Prohibition. Throughout the country, generally speaking, the County Option movement, or the Local Option movement, aims simply to rid the community of the liquor saloon. I have never met with any notable number of anti-saloon champions who entertained any thought, whatsoever, of dictating to the individual or to communities of individuals, what they should be required, by legal enactment, to eat or drink. Yet, directly in the face of repeated declarations that the advocates of County Option desire simply to relieve the community of the expensive and demoralizing burden of the saloon, the cry will be raised about "personal liberty", and the stomach of Timothy will be exhibited to the frightened gaze of the heresy-hunters, whose stomachs do not need "booze".

I wonder if these alarmists ever stop to consider how much comfort and encouragement their unfair assertions give to the enemies of sobriety, to the enemies of Christian morality and

common decency. We all understand, of course, that these extreme conservatives do not, for one moment, wish to encourage drunkenness or intemperance. For that matter, the keeper of the lowest dive in any of our cities will insist that he believes in temperance, but he too will quote the first miracle to justify the nefarious business in which he is engaged. There are no extracts from Holy Scripture quoted so frequently in the saloons of the land as these two, the one about the stomach of Timothy and the good wine at the marriage feast. Of course, every sane man knows very well that neither of these has anything to do with the problem of curbing the devastating curse of the saloon.

I confess my inability to understand what connexion the discussions or the deliberations of the Presbyterian Assembly have with the County Option problem. What bearing can the attitude of the Rev. Nathaniel Hewitt toward the use of wine have on the saloon problem in our cities to-day? He conducted a splendid campaign against the evils of excessive drinking in New England, in his day. The saloon problem to-day was unknown to temperance workers of New England in the days of the Rev. Nathaniel Hewitt. I hope that all honest men will be candid with the public. Prohibition may mean different things in different people. To antagonize the liquor power, which is one of the greatest dangers in our political life to-day, does not mean that we condemn the moderate use of wine, or of more ardent intoxicants. To favor County Option cannot be construed by any fair-minded man into an attempt to teach the heresy that intoxicating liquor is a *malum in se*. All Catholics are on safe lines when they follow the decrees and the conservative exhortations of the Baltimore Councils. They do not need any suggestions from any Presbyterian Assembly. We should not permit our own people and the general public to forget that the authorized public judgment of the Church in this country brands the business of selling intoxicating liquor as a "dangerous business". We are in far more danger of making serious mistakes in favor of the liquor business than we are in casting our influence against this "unbecoming way of making a living". Heresy-hunters can find much more work to do among the friends of the liquor traffic than they can find among its enemies. The saloon is the

fruitful source of sin and misery. It is the occasion of sin for all. It is the direct cause of more sin, vice, and irreligion among the people than all other evil causes combined. The saddest victims of its pitiless power are women and children who never cross its slimy threshold. It is not true that "if you let the saloon alone it will let you alone". If we only heed the wise warnings of our spiritual guides, and profit by the lessons of experience in dealing with the weaknesses of our people, we will cast our influence against the saloon. There is more heresy among the frequenters of the saloons of the land than can be detected even among the women of the W. C. T. U.

J. M. CLEARY,
Pastor of the Church of the Incarnation.
Minneapolis, Minnesota.

KYRIE ELEISON—WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Are there any prayers for the living, in the *Absolutio post Missam* for the dead?

"No," said Father Smith; "all the prayers from the 'Non intres' to the last Amen are for the dead."

"I disagree with you," interposed Father Jones; "before both sprinklings with holy water we say *Kyrie eleison,* 'Lord, have mercy on us,' a prayer for ourselves."

"Don't you think it strange," asked Father Smith, "that at the solemn moment when we are about to leave the sanctuary and approach the dead body which was the living temple of the Holy Ghost, and sprinkle it with holy water and incense it, that we should forget it and the soul that dwelt in it, and say a prayer for ourselves instead?"

"It is strange," Father Jones admitted.

"How do you translate *Kyrie*?" asked Father Smith.

"*Lord.*"

"Right; and how do you translate *eleison*?"

"*Have mercy.*"

"Right again," said Father Smith; "but you are mistaken in thinking that 'on us' must always be supplied after it. I can say *Kyrie eleison* for myself, which means 'Lord have mercy on me'. Whenever I say the triple invocation for

mercy over a dead body I am thinking of the dead man, and I translate it in my mind: 'Lord, have mercy on him'. 'Christ, have mercy on him'. 'Lord, have mercy on him'."

"Well," added Father Thomas, "I disagree with both of you; whenever I say *Kyrie eleison* at a funeral, I ask mercy for myself, for all present, and for the dead man also. It is a prayer for both the living and the dead." J. F. S.

THE RELIGIOUS HABIT AS SCAPULAR.

Qu. Can the place of the scapular be supplied by the habit of any religious order or congregation, so that the wearing of the habit entitles the wearer to the indulgences of the scapular for which it is a substitute? If yes, kindly state which scapulars and which orders or congregations.

Resp. The S. Congregation of Indulgences explained in a decree dated 18 August, 1868, that "the small scapulars which the faithful are wont to wear are identical in origin and institution with the scapulars which form part of the habit of the various religious orders, reduced in size for the greater convenience of the wearers". Going back further still, historians inform us that the monks in ancient times adopted the scapular on account of its convenience during the performance of manual labor, and especially while carrying heavy weights on their shoulders. In the course of time the scapular was made a portion of the regular habit. The oldest of the scapulars now generally worn, actually conform, and must *de jure* conform, in material, in color, and (substantially) in shape, to the larger scapular worn by the religious of certain orders and congregations. For instance, the scapulars of the Blessed Trinity, of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, of the Seven Dolors, of Our Lady of Mercy. The reception of these scapulars by the faithful has the effect not only of enabling the faithful to gain certain indulgences but also of entitling them to membership in a confraternity which is under the general guidance or directorship of the superior general of the respective order or religious congregation. There are other scapulars, which have only one of these effects, and some which have neither, but are worn only as a matter of devotion.

It seems clear that, when the smaller scapular is simply a reduced form of the scapular worn by a religious order or congregation, the latter has attached to it, at least, all the spiritual advantages attached to the former. Whether a laic may be invested with the unabridged scapular is another matter entirely. As to the last part of the question, namely, which scapulars are substitutes for the larger scapular worn by religious, we find it difficult to give a complete enumeration. The superiors of the respective orders or congregations are, no doubt, in possession of information which may be desired in the case of any particular scapular.

A DOUBT REGARDING THE CONFESSIONS OF NUNS.

Qu. A priest who is fully approved to hear the confessions of women visits a convent for the purpose of preaching a sermon. He is not, however, the ordinary or the extraordinary confessor of the convent. May he, while there, hear the confessions of the nuns?

Resp. It is certain that a nun may make her confession in any church to any priest who has faculties to hear the confessions of women. With regard to the exercise of this faculty, however, the rules laid down in the decree of the S. Congregation of Religious, 3 February, 1914, must be adhered to. According to this decree, Sisters can enjoy the privilege granted by it only when, for any reason whatsoever, they are actually outside the convent. Within the limits of the convent they enjoy no exemption from the ordinary laws regarding the confessions of nuns, and consequently they must make their confessions to one of the confessors, ordinary or extraordinary, who have faculties from the bishop for the confessions of nuns (Articles 4, 5, etc., of the decree).

A difficulty may, indeed, be raised in regard to the chapel of the convent. If it is a semi-public oratory, may the Sisters confess there to any approved priest, as provided in the decree in the case of a church outside the convent? The decree does not explicitly exclude semi-public oratories; at the same time, it does not include them. From the wording of the decree it is safe to infer that the only semi-public oratories in which Sisters may confess to any approved priest are those which are outside the limits of the convent.

HOLY COMMUNION BEFORE MASS.

Qu. Is it permitted to distribute Holy Communion before Mass merely that the communicants may have more time for thanksgiving, or is some greater reason necessary? When Holy Communion is distributed before Mass, should the blessing be given if the Mass is to be said in black?

Resp. It is in accordance with the spirit of the liturgy and in conformity with the primitive practice of the Church that Holy Communion be distributed to the faithful after the Communion of the celebrant and the ministers of the Mass. However, the S. Congregation of Rites has answered in the negative the question whether it is forbidden to distribute Holy Communion immediately before or after Mass, when there is a good reason, *justa de causa* (Decree N. 3852, ad 3^{um}). Recent and contemporary practice has interpreted as a "good reason" the convenience of the faithful in matters temporal or spiritual, and no fault can, we think, be found with the practice, so long as there is no danger of departing from the spirit of the liturgy. It would seem that the reason mentioned in the query is a "good" reason. Nevertheless, when Holy Communion is distributed immediately after or (*data rationabili causa*) immediately before a Requiem Mass, the blessing should be omitted (Decr. N. 3177).

CONFRATERNITY OF THE DIVINE INFANT OF PRAGUE—ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

An Irish Carmelite Father writes:

I am glad to see your further remarks regarding the Divine Infant of Prague in the November REVIEW. I am afraid, however, that what appeared in the October number may have placed the devotion in an unfavorable light in the minds of some, and therefore I hope you will think it right to place before your readers some of the following particulars. The devotion to His Divine Son must be pleasing to God and beneficial to souls, and in our day it is, as the REVIEW says, indeed timely. The word "Prague" has been attached to the devotion because, I think, it has been through the medium of the Prague statute that the devotion has become so widely spread.

The Confraternity of the Holy Infant of Prague—the same Confraternity that the Apostolic Letter of Pius X gives the General of the Discalced Carmelites power to establish—was erected in Loughrea in 1891, with the sanction of the Ordinary, and affiliated to the

Confraternity of Beaune (France). In the following year a booklet on the devotion was published in Ireland which bears the Imprimatur of Dr. Duggan, Bishop of Clonfert. Therein we are told the history of the devotion and of the statue of Prague.

A venerable Carmelite nun of the seventeenth century, Sister Margaret of the Blessed Sacrament, of Beaune, is looked upon as being the apostle of the formal devotion to the Divine Infant. There is a statue at Beaune also, quite different in form and appearance from that of Prague. It was the Bishop of Autun who established the Confraternity of the Holy Child. This Confraternity was approved in January 1661 by Alexander VII. After the Revolution, the Bishop of Dijon reëstablished the Confraternity as it was in the old Carmelite convent, by an order dated 26 December, 1821. Finally, in December 1855, Pius X erected it into an Archconfraternity, with power to affiliate and communicate its privileges.

It would be too long to enumerate here the indulgences attached to the devotion. Many plenary and partial indulgences were granted by Alexander VII and Pius IX. The indulgence attached to the recitation of the Beads of the Divine Child was conferred by Leo XIII, on the express condition that before each Pater and Ave the following words should be recited, "And the Word was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us".

Various practices are recommended to the members of the Confraternity; but the chief condition for gaining the indulgences and advantages of membership is to have one's name inscribed in the Registry of the Confraternity.

I pray you, dear Father, for the honor of the Divine Child and the good of souls, to give a further favorable notice of the matter in the REVIEW. X.

CATHOLICITY OR CATHOLICISM.

Qu. A few weeks ago a writer in *Our Sunday Visitor* complained that the word "Catholicism" was taking the place of "Catholicity", and I note with regret that "Catholicism" is frequently used by Catholic writers. In my opinion, this ought to cease. Why put God's Church on a par with the multitude of 'isms that are rampant throughout the country? It is a lowering of the Church. She alone has withstood all the 'isms of the past, and will be here when they have all gone their way. If it is at all possible, make an attempt through the REVIEW to replace the use of "Catholicism" by that of "Catholicity", which is by far the nobler word.

Resp. We confess to a full share in our correspondent's disdain for the multitude of 'isms, which, as he says, are rampant throughout the country, and would gladly contribute to

any feasible project for separating even in terminology the permanent truth from the mass of fluctuating errors. But language, unfortunately, is made and controlled, not by the philosophers and theologians, but by the crowd of untrained thinkers. Even dictionaries may not legislate regarding the meanings of words; they can only register what they call good usage. Thus, in the present matter, a dictionary which has very high authority in this country gives us:

Catholicism, (*Cap.*): 2. Faith, practice or system of a Catholic church, specif. of the Roman Catholic Church; Catholicity. 3. (*Cap.*) A peculiarity or characteristic of a good Catholic.

Catholicity. 2. Catholicism; specif. (*Cap.*) the character of belonging to, or being in conformity with, a Catholic church, esp. the Roman Catholic Church; the faith or doctrine of a Catholic Church; Catholicism.

If these definitions represent, as we believe they do, the usage of the best writers and speakers, there is not much room for choice between "Catholicism" and "Catholicity". The latter term, however, is fixed in its meaning, and should invariably be used when one is referring to the "Notes of the Church".

HANDLING SACRED VESSELS.

Qu. I have at hand the opinions of two different authors as to whether we may allow religious, nuns or brothers who are not yet clerics, to touch the sacred vessels, chalices, etc. One answers *affirmative*, the other, *negative;* and both give as their reason a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, 1 February, 1907, ad XV. Will you kindly quote the words of the decree in the next number of the REVIEW?

Resp. The question of religious handling the sacred vessels is treated in the REVIEW (July, p. 97, and August, p. 238). Sacred vessels which actually contain the Blessed Sacrament may not, apart from a case of necessity (generally, the danger of desecration), be handled except by a priest or a deacon. Sacred vessels which do not contain the Blessed Sacrament, as well as used purificators, corporals, etc., may be handled by clerics in minor orders, and even by laymen, when permission is duly granted. In the discussion just referred to (REVIEW, July, 1914, p. 97) it was stated that similar permission may be, and actually is, granted to religious

women. The decree to which our correspondent refers is entirely irrelevant. Dubium n. XV asks, "whether any other than the celebrant, for example a priest who is sacristan, may place the host on the paten in preparation for the Mass." The answer to this is, "Affirmative, dummodo qui id peragit prima saltem tonsura sit initiatus, juxta Decretum n. 4194, I, 23 Novembris, 1906, vel alias privilegium Apostolicum obtinuerit vasa sacra tangendi". Decree n. 4194 simply answers in the affirmative the question whether clerics who have received tonsure may without a special indult touch the sacred vessels.

OBLIGATION ARISING FROM ENGAGEMENT.

Qu. A (male, Catholic) pledged himself verbally to marry B (female, non-Catholic) after the new marriage law went into effect. A gets into financial difficulties, and, through an intermediary, secures a release (verbal) from B, who agrees however to wait one year for A. They have had no communication during that period, which has almost expired. B has agreed to give A a definite answer at the end of the year, but says nothing as to her course of action should she not hear from A at the expiration of that term. A now feels that the difference of religion would make the marriage unwise. Is he bound *in foro conscientiae* to renew his offer to B?

Resp. There is here of course no question of betrothal in the canonical sense, since there is no written promise. It appears that the suggestion to wait till the end of one year came from B. She may not, therefore, have released A absolutely, and it would seem consequently that he is obliged at the end of a year to ask for a release. The wording of the case is not clear. If B released A from his promise, and then intimated that at the end of a year she would like to hear from him again, he is released, and is not bound to renew his proposal. If she communicates with him at the end of the year, he is of course obliged to send her a definite answer.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW YEAR BOOK.

In THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW YEAR BOOK for 1916, copy of which was sent last month to every subscriber, there are two misprints. It should be noted that on 16 January private Votive Mass is *not* allowed; and on 21 January Low Mass of Requiem is *not* allowed.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

CHRISTOLOGICAL THEORIES. II.

Conservative Jewish Christology. We have thus far given the Christology of the Talmud and of medieval Jewish writers,[1] and have dwelt somewhat at length upon the ideas of Liberal Judaism toward the Christ.[2] Among conservative Jews, we singled out Michael Friedländer, Principal of Jews' College, London, as representative of a type of the Jewish attitude toward Jesus. He condemns Liberal Judaism and hopes for a personal Messias.[3]

1. *Michael Friedländer.* In *The Jewish Religion*[4] little reference is made by Michael Friedländer to Christologies. The book is of use to priests chiefly for its orthodox Judaism and brief summary of the Jewish creed and customs.

a. *Jewish Creed.* The first part of the work, Our Creed (pp. 5-232), culls from the authoritative rabbinic scholars the Jewish articles of faith. There are "Thirteen Principles of Faith" that sum up the creed of the orthodox Jew. These principles are the Existence of the Deity, His unity, spirituality, eternity, unicity, etc. Creation *ex nihilo* (p. 34), the possibility of miracles (p. 33), and other such fundamental truths of supernatural religion are upheld.

The twelfth of these principles of the Jewish creed is the Messianic: "I firmly believe in the coming of the Messiah; and although he may tarry, I daily hope for his coming". The burden of Moses,[5] of Isaias, and of the other great Messianic prophets of Israel is interpreted in a strictly prophetic and Messianic sense. Although we cannot admit this sense in regard to a Messias still to come, it is refreshing to find a Jewish writer of to-day who believes at all in the supernatural and in prophecy. The texts that Friedländer cites are unfortu-

[1] ECCL. REVIEW, November, 1915, pp. 598 ff.
[2] ECCL. REVIEW, December, 1915, pp. 708 ff.
[3] ECCL. REVIEW, Dec. 1915, pp. 710 ff.
[4] 3d. ed. (Buegileisen: New York, 1915—5675).
[5] Deut. 30: 1-3.

nately the very vaguest in Messianic meaning.[6] Those that the Synoptists pick out as fulfilled in Jesus, are rather summarily set aside or entirely omitted. Thus are they treated in bulk:

> Christians quoted passages from Isaiah which had no reference whatever to Messiah in evidence of the Messianity of Jesus. Children born in the days of Isaiah (7:14; 8:18), whose names had reference to good or evil events of the time, were wrongly interpreted as referring to the birth of Jesus; the sufferings and final relief of the servant of the Lord, that is, Israel (chaps. 52 and 53), were applied to Jesus; the Psalmist who sings of victories which God will grant to David (Ps. 100) is made to declare the divinity of Jesus.[7]

In regard to Malachy, we have another instance of this one-sided method of interpretation. In place of taking up the clear and concrete prophecies that Christians have ever made use of as prophetic references to the eucharistic sacrifice, Friedländer gives as the message of Malachy one of the vague forms of his Messianic burden:

> And the sacrifice of Juda and of Jerusalem shall please the Lord, as in the days of old, and in the ancient years. (Mal. 3:4).

The interpretation is set forth that the Temple is to be as of old; the Temple service is to be restored; the priests will return to their tasks, the levites to their cantilation of psalms.[8]

Here, as elsewhere, Friedländer omits to mention the classic texts of the prophet he cites. The burden of Malachy cannot be scientifically interpreted by a single and very indefinite prophecy. It were only fair and square to face the concrete and definite allusion to the eucharistic sacrifice that all Catholic theologians have for centuries insisted upon:

> Who is there among you that will shut the doors, and will kindle the fire on my altar gratis? I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts; and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered

[6] *The Jewish Religion*, p. 155 ff.
[7] Ibid., p. 225.
[8] Ibid., p. 162.

to my name a clean oblation; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts. (Mal. 1: 10-11.)

In this classic passage, there is no sign of the rebuilding of the Temple on Sion or of the restoration thereon of the Yahwistic cult "as in days of old". Quite the contrary, the new liturgical service is to be among Gentiles, and everywhere. It would be interesting to know what conservative Judaism thinks of this universal worship foretold by Malachy.

b. *Jewish Duties.* The second part of *The Jewish Religion,* is entitled "Our Duties" (pp. 233-336). The duties toward God and man are given in an orderly form. Very interesting notes then follow. The wearing of fringes, *sisith,* upon the scarf, *talith,* during prayer, as an outward reminder of God's presence, is still insisted upon; so, too, the *tefillin* or phylacteries. These latter are strips of parchment inscribed with passages of Scripture and enclosed in a case; during morning prayer the case is bound with thongs "for a sign" upon the left arm; and "for a frontlet" upon the forehead.[9]

Here are the details of the process by which food is rendered fit, *kasher.* It is prohibited to eat the blood of beasts and birds.[10] Hence this blood is removed by draining and by soaking the meat in water for half an hour. Then the meat is kept covered with salt for an hour and given a final rinsing.[11] It is then *fit* to eat, *kasher*—pronounced *kosher* by the German Jew.

2. *Gerald Friedländer.* Conservative in his Judaism, Gerald Friedländer is just as opposed to the Messianic claims of Jesus as is Michael and more modern in his mode of opposition.

a. *Conservative in Judaism.* The conservative Judaism of Gerald Friedländer, Minister of the Western Synagogue, London, is seen chiefly in his *Rabbinic Philosophy and Ethics,*[12] an attempt to illustrate Jewish philosophical and ethical notions by a judicious selection from the Haggadic legends and parables of Judaism. The Haggadoth stories

[9] Deut. 6: 8, 11: 18; Exod. 13: 9, 16.

[10] Lev. 17: 12, 14.

[11] *The Jewish Religion,* pp. 459, 463.

[12] P. Vallentine and Sons: London, 1912.

(from the root meaning "to narrate") are to be distinguished from the Halakhoth. A Halakhah (from *halakh*, "to walk") is a custom, law or decree, not contained in Scripture but handed down by tradition, according to which the Jew should walk in the way of the Torah or Law of Moses. These Halakhoth were codified by Yehudah ha-Nasi about A. D. 220; they make up the Mishna. The Haggadah is any one of the stories, legends, homilies and other non-legal portions of rabbinical literature. It takes in ideas about astronomy, astrology, medicine, magic, philosophy, etc., together with a deal of folklore. These Haggadoth are of much greater human interest than are the Halakhoth; and yet the Halakhic portion is by far the greater and more important in the Talmud. That is why the Haggadic is rather neglected. And this neglect occasions Friedländer's studies. For, as he says, Haggadah includes much more than

> Astrology, medicine and magic, theosophy and mysticism, and similar subjects, falling mostly under the heading of folklore. . . . It comprises the belief and hope of Israel, the description of the Kingdom of God, of the Messianic age, and of the life to come.[13]

The source of Haggadah, according to Friedländer, is any document that gives testimony of the traditional and non-legal beliefs and hopes of Israel; in this wise, not merely the Talmud and Midrash but the Targumim, Josephus, Philo, the Apocrypha and even the New Testament become sources of Haggadah.

b. *Opposition to Christianity.* Gerald Friedländer is more modern in his mode of opposition to the Messianic claims of Jesus than is Michael. The latter ignores the Old Testament prophecies that we hold were fulfilled in the Christ; the former faces them, not very happily nor always fairly and yet after some fashion. We shall illustrate this fashion.

According to the Haggadic tradition, the ass which Abraham saddled, when about to start for the sacrifice of his son Isaac,[14] was "the offspring of that ass which was created during the twilight (preceding the first Sabbath)".[15] This very

[13] Op cit., p. vi.
[14] Gen. 22:3.
[15] *Rabbinic Philosophy*, p. 70.

same ass was ridden by Moses; for "Moses took his wife and his sons, and set them upon *the* ass, and he returned to the land of Egypt".[16] And the same identical ass will be ridden "by the Son of David (the Messiah)". For it is written:

> Rejoice, O daughter of Sion;
> Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem.
> Behold thy King cometh unto thee;
> He is just and hath salvation;
> Lowly and riding upon an ass,—
> Even upon a colt, the foal of an ass.
> (Mal. 9:9.)

The rabbi, after citing Zacharias's prophecy as Messianic, gives the following footnote, which is illustrative of the unfairness with which he approaches Christianity:

> In the Gospels the Founder of Christianity is represented as fulfilling this prophecy of the Messianic age. Strange to relate, he is said to have ridden *at one and the same time upon an ass and a colt.*[17]

Now just where is the Founder of Christianity "said to have ridden *at one and the same time upon an ass and a colt*"? That would, indeed, be *strange to relate,* especially strange in view of the rabbinical Haggadah that the ass in question was to have been the very same as Abraham saddled and Moses rode. But *strange to relate,* no such ridiculous picture is presented "in the Gospels" as Friedländer fancies. The Gospels are not depositories of outlandish Haggadic legends such as abound in the Talmud and Midrash. Mark (11:7-10), Luke (19:35-44) and John (12:12-19) speak only of the colt upon which Jesus rode. In fairness, Friedländer should have referred to these three evangelists; he should not have attributed to "the Gospels" a fact that *seemed to be contained* in only one of the Synoptists. He should not have juggled with the text. In the verse of Matthew that Friedländer refers to, Jesus is not "said to have ridden *at one and the same time upon an ass and a colt*". Matthew narrates:

> And they brought the ass and the colt, and laid their garments upon them and made him sit upon them. (Mt. 21:7.)

[16] Ex. 4:20.

[17] *Rabbinic Philosophy,* p. 70.

The words *upon them*, ἐπάνω αὐτῶν, do not refer to the ass and the colt but to the garments set upon the colt. Jesus is said to have sat *upon these garments* and not *at one and the same time upon an ass and a colt.*

c. *Misled by Modern Christologies.* Gerald Friedländer is not only more modern than Michael in his way of facing our Messianic texts and that unfairly; he is unfortunately saturated and made noxious by modern Christian Christologies. The influence of the many Christ-theories of so-called Christian professors of Scripture has resulted in the Liberal Judaism of Montefiore, who echoes each and every utterance of Loisy and clings merely to a vague sort of Theism or Unitarianism;[18] the nondescript Judaism of Reinach, who goes the length of making all religion to be a mere summary of *taboos;*[19] and the Conservative Judaism of Gerald Friedländer, who clings to the supernatural elements of Mosaic Yahwistic cult and at the same time would deny to Christianity anything more than an Hellenistic origin. His theory of Christianity is that Hellenism and not Judaism "is to be held responsible for the origin and development of Christological terms and ideas".[20]

This theory is not new but commonplace among Christian theorists in the realm of un-Christian and purely natural Christology. The arguments used to prop up the idea of an Hellenistic origin of Christianity are the old props that have often been felled. Friedländer thinks that there was nothing of historical fact upon which Paul built up the Messianic theology of his letters:

> It was just this lack of historical fact that enabled the Church to develop her ideal Christ without fearing the criticism of history. . . . In proportion as the picture of the historical Jesus lacked reality, so much the more did Paul press forward his Messiah theology. In other words, the want of historical fact was compensated for by the abundance of metaphysics. Paul's theology *thrust aside the figure of the human or historical Jesus* in order to dwell on the Heavenly Christ.[21]

[18] Cf. ECCL. REVIEW, Nov. 1915, pp. 605 ff.; Dec. 1915, pp. 708 ff.
[19] Cf. ECCL. REVIEW, Dec. 1915, pp. 711 ff.
[20] *Hellenism and Christianity* (Vallentine & Sons: London, 1913), p. x.
[21] *Hellenism and Christianity*, p. 84.

No proof is given. We must accept the *ipse dixit* of Friedländer, unless we read a little of St. Paul himself in regard to the Jesus he is supposed to have set aside. He writes to the Galatians: "O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth—crucified among you." [22] Is that thrusting aside the human Jesus? Well, perhaps Paul does "*thrust aside the figure of the human or historical Jesus*", when he says: "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Gentiles foolishness".[23] Would He not have been less of a stumbling-block to Judaism, if Paul had *thrust* aside that crucified Jesus and preached only the Heavenly Christ? Yes, but he had a Heavenly Christ who was also the crucified Jesus. And Paul would not separate the two, even to please Rabbi Friedländer. He would say to-day to the Jew of this rabbi's sort, as he said to the Judaeo-Hellenistic community of Corinth: "I judged myself not to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ and him crucified." [24] Would that be throwing aside the human Christ?

WALTER DRUM, S.J.

Woodstock, Maryland.

[22] Gal. 3:1.
[23] 1 Cor. 1:23.
[24] 1 Cor. 2:2.

Criticisms and Notes

A MANUAL OF APOLOGETICS. By the Rev. F. J. Koch. Translated, from the revised German edition, by A. M. Buchanan, M.A. (London). Revised and edited by the Rev. Charles Bruehl, D.D., Professor at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa. Joseph F. Wagner, New York. 1915. Pp. viii–2 2.

DIEU : SON EXISTENCE ET SA NATURE. Solution Thomiste des Antinomies Agnostiques. Par P. Fr. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., Professeur de Théologie au Collège Angélique, Rome. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1915. Pp. 910.

The story is often told, with varying embellishments, that the Seraphic Saint of Assisi, when passing one day the hall of theology in his convent, and inquiring about the subject of discussion going on at the moment, was told that the professor was lecturing on the proofs for the existence of God. "Is it possible that time is being spent in arguing so evident a truth? Have they nothing more important to do?" asked the astonished Saint, whose consciousness of the Divine Existence was well-nigh perpetual and in a certain sense intuitive. Perhaps, had St. Francis lived in the twentieth instead of the thirteenth century, he would not have deemed it vain to re-state, re-analyze and re-confirm the grounds whereon the human intellect bases its certitude of the existence of the Infinite Creator and ultimate end of the world and of man. It may well be that the arguments formulated by the manuals of theodicy do not beget conviction in the mind of an atheist or an agnostic. Nevertheless the failure, if such it be, is not due to any inherent flaw in the arguments themselves, but either to the manner in which they are presented by the champions of them or in the intellectual and moral state of the reader or hearer. *Quidquid recipitur recipitur secundum modum recipientis.*

"Never has the necessity of an intellectual defence of Catholic principles been more imperative and general than in our days, when every department of human knowledge is made to yield weapons for a concerted and systematic attack on the very foundations of supernatural belief." What Dr. Bruehl here observes as regards "Catholic principles" and "supernatural belief" may be extended to the very foundations of all, even purely rational, convictions and to well-nigh every intellectual or supersensible cognition. And hence, as the same editor of the *Manual* before us goes on to remark, "none but an enlightened faith will be proof against the crafty and villainous on-

slaught of modern infidelity, which is magnificently equipped for its work of destruction. Ignorance of fundamental principles is the treacherous rock on which faith has frequently been wrecked." Hence the vital importance of works such as are here introduced.

Fr. Koch's *Manual of Apologetics* is a systematic, though on the whole sufficiently popular, defence of the foundations of faith. Fr. Lagrange's work on theism is an elaborate and a profound study of the existence and nature of God. The two works are mutually supplementary. The volume in English covers the main groundwork of faith—God, His Existence and Nature, His Work, His Word, or Revelation to Man, His Incarnation, His Kingdom, the Church. The volume in French is confined to the existence and nature of God alone. In the former volume the theistic arguments are briefly though clearly stated and developed with relative adequacy. Beyond this, the old but ever new aspects of God's works are discussed. The origin and nature of man, the antiquity of the race, the fall, original sin—the mere mention of these titles, omitting others no less important, suffices to show what burning issues are here reviewed. Next come revelation, the *motiva credibilitatis*, the Bible, and kindred topics. The Divinity of Christ is thoroughly proved, and lastly the origin, constitution, and the mission of the Church and other questions pertinent to these are expounded. Old themes they all are, but they need ever renewed treatment in order to adjust them to new ways of thinking and to oppose new forms of error. Fortunately the book has found a capable translator who knows how to write English that is *not* "made in Germany". Moreover the publisher and printer have done their part by typographical devices to facilitate *study* of the Manual. We emphasize the word *study*, for the book in its matter and form is primarily adapted for the class-hall. It might with great advantage be employed in seminaries, certainly in preparatory seminaries; for it is really a digest of fundamental theology and could therefore be used as an introduction to the latter branch, which is usually studied through a Latin medium. The book should likewise find a place in our colleges and in the upper classes of our high schools. The complaint is often heard that many of our youths are inadequately prepared to meet the insidious attacks of modern infidelity. When they hear or read objections against their faith, they know not what or how to reply. Thus they sometimes lose, if they do not deny, their faith. With the present Manual and the aid of a competent teacher such danger would be made at least more remote.

In addition, however, to this didactic adaptation, the book will do excellent service by enabling Catholic men and women to give answers to the questions concerning the basis of their faith that are

put to them by their non-Catholic associates, while the latter class of inquirers will be greatly benefitted by having the Manual placed in their own hands.

Passing now from the more elementary exposition in English of the *præambula fidei* to the elaborate work in French, we come to a treatise, as profound as it is learned, on the existence and nature of God. Students of this subject may already be familiar with a smaller volume by the same author which appeared some six years ago, under the title *Le Sens commun, et la Philosophie de l'être*, and which was reviewed at the time in these pages. The central thesis of that book was that "common sense", plain, everyday natural reason, is subjectively the organ and objectively the substance of what Fr. Lagrange calls "a rudimentary philosophy of being", as distinguished from a philosophy of phenomena or of transition (*devenir, fieri*). The intellect spontaneously intuits being, reality; hence, as he says, "the formal, primary, and adequate object of common sense is being and the primary principles implied therein". In the present volume this "philosophy of common sense" is elaborated in its relation to theodicy; that is, the primary principles are shown to grow first into the classical proofs for God's existence, and secondly into a reasoned exposition of God's nature and attributes. The principle of identity or of consistency (non-contradiction) is proved to be the remote ground, while the principles of sufficient reason and of causality are the proximate ground of the theistic arguments. These principles, it is seen, are not merely formal laws of thought: they are ontological, objective grounds of reality. They have, moreover, a transcendent value; are applicable to Being underived and infinite as well as being created and limited. Of course the concept of being can be applied only analogically to the Infinite, since in itself it is subjectively only a finite form, while objectively it prescinds alike from the infinite and the finite. It is by keeping constantly in view this analogical character of the concept and principles of being that the antinomies of reason which Kant and the agnostics allege against theists, can be satisfactorily solved. The substance therefore of the volume before us consists of an ever progressive unfolding of these principles in their analogical application. Students consequently of metaphysics and theology will find here a veritable "feast of reason"; and likewise, provided their own inner life be correspondingly adapted, "a [non-Epicurean] flow of soul". Fr. Lagrange adheres closely to St. Thomas and "moderate realism" over against Scotus, and "extreme realism". He has not, however, imitated the Angelic Doctor by writing a book *secundum quod congruit eruditionem incipientium;* nor has he had in mind *hujus doctrinæ novi-*

tios, and so he provides not "milk for babes", but "meat for strong men". Whoso would profit by the book must be willing to do some intellectual work, some right vigorous thinking, though the author by his characteristically French clarity of exposition and expression has done not a little to reduce the labor to its lowest practical terms. Moreover, taking courage from the well-known *effatum* of Aristotle, that a little knowledge of big things is worth more than a big knowledge of little things, the student will find that he is amply rewarded by devoting his intellect to these lofty themes. He is helped to see more deeply and widely into spiritual truth. Extensive cultivation is not sacrificed to intensive, nor is it here true that *quo major intensio eo minor extensio*. The two processes are not in inverse but direct proportion. The appetite for these things will grow by what it feeds upon.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. By the Rev. Peter Finlay, S.J. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1915. Pp. 276.

It goes without saying that a book from the pen of Father Finlay, whatever be his theme, will be both thoughtful and interesting and well worth reading. Especially will this be so when the subject is theological—a region which he has made his own and wherein he speaks with acknowledged authority. The volume before us embodies a series of eight lectures which the author delivered in the Dublin College of the National University of Ireland. The subject-matter treated is the foundation and constitution of the Church. The line of exposition and argument is familiar to most educated Catholics. The New Testament writings, taken first as human documents, are proved to rest on irrefragable historical evidence. The Divinity of our Lord is then substantiated from these sources. They also prove that Christ instituted a Society, which He called His Church, and which He promised would continue on to the end of time indestructible, infallible in faith and teaching, numerically and organically one, the ordinary source and channel of His graces to man. "That Church exists to-day and can only be the Roman Catholic Church, since she alone possesses that unity in Catholicity which Christ promised to His Church and since she alone is and claims to be infallible" (p. 260). This, as was said above, is obviously a well known line of argument—the *demonstratio Christiano-Catholica*. What may be said for it in the present case is that it stands out in perfect luminousness and fulness. The truths exposed shine right into the intellect and leave there no shade or shadow. Then, too, the law of prudent parsimony is dominant. *Non troppo*, either in the way of exposition or of proof. Firm and strong in its positions—the *fortiter*

in re—it is considerate and sympathetic in the manner and style of presentation—the *suaviter in modo*. Shunning as far as may be the *bête noire* of controversy, its positive exposition defends and draws; it will not offend nor repel. Catholics and non-Catholics will be the wiser and the better for having read these luminous lectures.

The book is neatly made and provided with an index, as well as an analytical table of contents—an unwonted benefaction in a volume of its compass.

A STUDY IN SOCIALISM. By Benedict Elder. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 341.

So long as Socialism continues to be a living movement, subject therefore to the mutations of growth and decay, which is the law of all organisms, social no less than physical, there will be need to keep studying it afresh, reëxamining its methods and proposals, in order to measure its approach to or recession from sound principles and sane practical standards. While therefore we have already from Catholic pens a goodly number of works, most of them excellent indeed, which treat of pretty nearly every aspect of Socialist principle and practice, there will nevertheless be a welcome place on the library table—we had almost said *shelf*, the place of rest and dust undisturbed—for the most recent study of Socialism embodied in the volume at hand.

The author finds it hard to give a precise meaning to Socialism—not the word, but the thing, the theory, the system, the movement. He quotes the familiar puzzle in which St. Augustine finds himself in respect to the nature of time. "I know it if you do not ask me." Socialism, he says, "may be called a modern social phenomenon. It springs from modern industrial conditions as they are combined with the more modern phase of sentiment and thought." And then he adds, "A more particular definition would only invite criticism and dispute" (p. iii). To justify the omission of any further effort to define Socialism, Mr. Elder next goes on to mention a great many things that Socialists say about their system—all which together serve to prove that Socialists are much at variance with one another. This no doubt is true and quite generally known and admitted. But why not single out that one thing in which they all do agree, and as to which there is no dissentience? namely, "Socialism is," as Schaeffle said long ago, in his *Quintessence of Socialism* (a book which still remains probably the best critique of economic Socialism), "Socialism is Collectivism"; that is, communal possession of the means of production and communal administration and distribution of the product. Around this central idea and essential demand Socialists

have woven a mesh of religious, moral, philosophical, economic, political, and social theories. Socialist writers have propagandized these speculative opinions and Socialist congresses have given them more or less definite shape in formulas. All this mass and maze of speculation, set into a current in modern society, constitutes the Socialist movement. The latter is therefore a colluvies of opinions, feelings, desires, tendencies, commingling all in a flux and heaving-up now one now another of the bedraggled flotsam. But steadily through all the welter is manifest the central dominant thing, collectivism.

It were greatly to be desired that critics of Socialism would confine themselves to this one essential, or at least would treat the other aspects as concomitants. No doubt in the minds of Socialist leaders materialism and irreligion are the dominant forces; but the rank and file of Socialists simply hope to get from the movement a more equitable share of the wealth produced in and by society.

In the book before us Socialism is taken in its broad colluvial sweep. The author singles out certain principles which he discerns actuating the movement: the economic, the philosophical, the religious, the moral, the political, and the social principle. The first part of the volume is devoted to a destructive criticism of these principles (p. 134). The second part gives a brief history of Socialism (pp. 135-218). The third part discusses the aims of Socialism (pp. 219-290). In conclusion there is given a succinct summary and a fairly extensive list of authorities.

Covering as the book does lines of criticism already made by a number of preceding Catholic authors, such as Cathrein, Goldstein, Ming, Boyle, Vaughan, Ryan, to mention only the better known authorities, it may seem to add nothing to what has already been said, and said equally well, on the subject. A little close reading, however, will show that the author thinks for himself, and thinks vigorously; and while he has not originated a great deal, his work is well worth reading for its critical insight and its suggestive and stimulating ideas. Besides, it has the advantage of recency and is abreast with the newer Socialist literature. It should not supplant but rather supplement its predecessors.

Here and there one notices a slight inaccuracy which might be attended to in a future edition. For instance, it is not exact to say, "extravagance in making an observation the basis for a universal law is one of the dominant characteristics of Darwinism" (p. 33). Darwinists, whatever their other shortcomings, were and are rather careful to make very many observations before inducing what they (however wrongly) call a law. It might be noted that "the principle of causality" is a technical expression in philosophy and does

not answer at all to the formula assigned to it at the foot of page 46. Though obviously there *should* be no class struggle between capitalists and workingmen, it is hardly true to say that there *is* no such struggle, as is said on page 296.

It is gratifying to know that Mr. Elder has in preparation a series of books designed to treat of modern social evils and their correction. Readers of the present work, seeing from the author's discussion of Socialism in the present volume how far the latter system is from being a possible remedy for those evils, will eagerly await the constructive suggestions which are to be proposed in the promised series.

A SHORT HISTORY OF GERMANY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE YEAR 1913. By Francis M. Schirp, Ph.D. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 264.

If you were asked to recommend a concise history of Germany written by a Catholic author, what would you answer? You might think of Janssen's great work, but you would quickly remember the many volumes comprised in the still uncompleted translation of that monumental production; nor would you forget that the work even when finished will be confined to post-medieval Germany. *The History of the Christian Era* by Fr. Guggenberger, S.J., might occur to you as containing a good deal of material on the subject; but you would see at once that you were recommending a general history of Christendom in order to direct the inquirer to the special history of an individual country. You would then probably tell the querist that the object of his search had no existence, "nulla actualitas extra suas causas"; that it was still in "potentia objectiva", "inter possibilia metaphysica"—an answer which might open the eyes while closing the mouth of the new searcher after old knowledge. Now, however, that you see the title above, you will know that there exists in English at least one single book of its class. You will find it to be an attractive little volume, clearly written, succinct in statement, and comprehensive enough in view of the fact that it tells the story of the German people from the time they emerge from the twilight of fable down to the eve of the present war. To do all this within the compass of so small a volume required considerable skill in the art of compression as well as judicious elimination. The work is not, however, scrappy or indexish. It is not exactly a text-book, though it might well be put to such use. It is a book for the general reader, giving him a bird's-eye view of the growth, development, and present political and social status of Germany. The history of the Reformation—the portion of the book which sums up Janssen—is useful.

What, however, will profit the average non-specialized reader most will be the appendices, in which within a few pages is given an outline of the constitution, the military system, and some aspects of social legislation of Germany. It is to be hoped that the book will serve to spread more broadly a truer knowledge of a great people who count many millions of our brethren and who really are not as black as they are just now being painted.

CHIFFONS DE PAPIER. Ce qu'il faut savoir des Origines de la Guerre de 1914. Par Daniel Bellet, Lauréat de l'Institut, Secrétaire perpétuel de la Société d'Economie Politique de Paris, Professeur à l'École Libre des Sciences Politiques et a l'École des Hautes Etudes Commerciales. Plon-Nourrit & Cie., Paris. 1915. Pp. 57.

LA GUERRE: QUI L'A VOULUE? D'apres les documents diplomatiques. Par Paul Dudon. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. 61.

LES LEOONS DU LIVRE JAUNE (1914). Par Henri Welschinger de l'Institut. (No. 17, "Pages actuelles" 1914–1915.) Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1915. Pp. 141.

L'ALLEMAGNE ET LA GUERRE EUROPEENNE. Par Albert Sauveur, Professor à Harvard University. Avec une Préface de Henri Le Chatelier de l'Académie des Sciences. (No. 33, "Pages actuelles" 1914–1915.) Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1915. Pp. 70.

LES ORUAUTES ALLEMANDES. Réquisitoire d'un Neutre. Par Léon Maccas, Docteur en Droit de l'Université d'Athenes. Préface de M. Paul Girard, de l'Institut. (La Guerre de 1914.) Nouvelle édition, 60 mille. Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, Paris. 1915. Pp. xv–309.

L'ARMEE DU CRIME. Par Vindex. D'apres le Rapport de la Commission Francaise d'Enquête. (No. 9, "Pages actuelles", 1914–1915.) Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1915.

LES PROCEDES DE GUERRE DES ALLEMANDES EN BELGIQUE. Par Henri Davignon. (No. 21. "Pages actuelles", 1914–1915.) Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1915. Pp. 48.

LE LIVRE DE LA CONSOLATION. Par Dom Hébrard, Benedictin de l'Abbaye Saint-Martin, de Ligugé. (Aux Femmes de France.) Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1915. Pp. 280.

L'INTERET DE LA FRANCE ET L'INTEGRITE DE L'AUTRICHE-HONGRIE. Par Georges Vielmont. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1915. Pp. 137.

DER DEUTSCHE KATHOLIZISMUS IM WELTKRIEGE. Gesammelte Kriegsaufsatze aus der Zeitschrift "Theologie und Glaube", herausgegeben von den Professoren der bischoflichen philosophisch-theologischen Fakultät zu Paderborn. Mit einen Vorwort von Dr. Karl Joseph Schulte, Bischof von Paderborn. Ferdinand Schönigh, Paderborn. 1915. Seiten vii–192.

It is practically impossible to keep abreast with the stream of war literature unceasingly flowing from the press, especially in France. A few are caught out from the flood and subjected to the examination they appear to deserve. A few more are mentioned elsewhere in the present issue.

The present generation will not be able to fix the responsibility for the outbreak of the European conflagration; it cannot even get at the true facts, let alone the proper valuation and interpretation of these facts. Hence all publications bearing on the causes of the war are one-sided; they show the characteristics of the lawyer's brief rather than of the historian's calm, impartial exposition. They do, however, furnish the material which the historian of the future will have to use in framing his judgment. And it will be no easy task to separate the grain from the chaff. This general remark applies more or less to the four small pamphlets, mentioned by title above, coming from France and laying the blame of the war at the door of Germany.

The unhappy phrase of the German Chancellor furnishes the title for the first pamphlet. To the satisfaction of every Frenchman it proves conclusively that Germany has brought about the present condition of affairs in Europe. It does not, however, touch on the remoter causes underlying this gigantic struggle; yet, this war is only an episode in a long chain of historical events and can be rightly gauged only in the light of the past. We, the contemporaries, lack perspective to see the relative proportion and importance of the manifold causes that have led up to this fierce contest of the nations for European supremacy.

If all diplomatic documents were the exact expressions of unequivocal truth, we might readily get at the root of the matter. But as far as the war is concerned these documents are pleas of defence and must be discounted as such. Thus, even literal quotations from the "Yellow Book" or the "White Book" cannot be considered as unimpeachable evidence. Neither Paul Dudon's nor Henri Welschinger's conclusions as to the culpability of Germany can be regarded as final and convincing, though much of the material compiled in their booklets is of great value and authority.

Prof. Albert Sauveur of Harvard makes an attempt at sifting the material and getting a clear view of the situation. It is apparent, notwithstanding, that his sympathies and all the subconscious tendencies of his soul are with the Allies. We cannot expect an impartial statement of the merits of the case from his pen. The plea is well written and highly seasoned with bitter irony.

Certain horrors are inseparable from warfare, not excepting what we call civilized warfare. War calls to the fore what is worst in man and stirs up in his soul the primeval, brutal passions. Once aroused and lashed into fury, it is difficult to check and restrain them. The next three pamphlets on the list above depict in lurid colors the atrocities committed by the German soldiery. The authors are one in attributing the alleged cruelties to a definite premeditated system of terrorism ruthlessly carried out by the German military authorities. The sources from which they draw their facts do not always seem to be beyond criticism, and the basis for their sweeping generalizations is rather slender. We are inclined to believe that the evidence here adduced would not be deemed sufficient to convict anybody before a jury of twelve men honest, true, and unprejudiced. From the nature of the case these booklets do not afford pleasant reading. They may have the effect of humbling our pride; for we all possess a common humanity, and in the mirror of the events here related, we see how much barbarity there still exists beneath the outward gloss of civilization. All in all, we think that there is too much paper and ink used in this war.

From the perusal of the above mentioned booklets one turns with a sense of relief and internal purification to the sweet and delightful pages of Father Hébrard's book of spiritual solace. It is conceived on the broadest lines and strikes a chord of universal appeal. It embodies the best religious traditions of France. Here one feels the heart-beat of the true France, great and sublime and beautiful with its crown of sorrow. To comfort mothers and wives who have been bereft of all that is dear to them and whose hearts are crushed by a weight of unutterable grief, is beyond the powers of unaided reason. But faith has a balm for every heartache, and it is this sweet and healing balm which the author, to whom, in his cloistered cell, the supernatural has become a living and abiding presence, applies to the terrible afflictions and the overwhelming woes of the noble and brave women of France. Of course, the booklet may be read with great spiritual profit by anyone whose heart has been smitten by the cruel blows of adversity.

Prophesying and foreshadowing the probable outcome of the European conflict and the resultant re-alignment of nations and states is at this stage of events an unprofitable pastime. That is what we have against Mr. Vielmont's otherwise very instructive study. The historical survey of the rivalry of France and the House of Hapsburg is succinct and fair. In his forecasting of future events we cannot follow the author. If there are indications that the present struggle will lead to a disruption of the Dual Monarchy, there are equally strong evidences that would rather suggest a closer union of the two kingdoms as a not unlikely consequence of the war.

German Catholics have been severely assailed by their brethren in France for their pretended complicity in the aggressiveness of the Empire. In a number of articles, which appeared in *Theologie und Glaube*, a periodical published by the faculty of the episcopal seminary of Paderborn, these charges are refuted, and the honor of German Catholicism is vindicated. These timely essays are now issued in book form. They deal with the religious phases of the war and touch on many an interesting problem. We cannot help admiring the self-restraint and the moderation of the various authors, who do not allow their Teutonic temperament to get the best of them in the face of accusations which to them must appear both slanderous and malicious. Abstract topics, such as providence and war, the ethics of patriotism, are treated with wonted German thoroughness and fulness of detail.

Literary Chat

There is shortly to appear a new volume of clerical essays by Father Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C. As his former book, *Priestly Practice*, published in 1914, is now going into its third edition, there is an antecedent probability that the forthcoming volume, *Clerical Colloquies*, will be cordially welcomed.

The Fall of the House of Pedagogues, by the Rev. Francis O'Neill, O.P., is an apt plea for our Catholic schools as contrasted with the various efforts in the field of education which lay stress upon the secular elements of literary and scientific, to the exclusion of adequate religious or moral training. The author aims at lessening the zeal among Catholic educators for rivaling the theories of the modern pedagogues whose avowed purpose is to establish "humanitarian" principles and "social consciousness" as a substitute for religion. The title of the pamphlet seems to indicate that the modern pagan pedagogy has been routed out of the field, which is by no means the case; but Fr. O'Neill offers a good weapon for driving it from Catholic schools. (Central Bureau, Temple Building, St. Louis, Mo.)

The cult of that lovable young Carmelite, Sœur Thérèse of the Child Jesus, better known as the Little Flower of Lisieux, is being steadily urged by means of very attractive publications embodying her life and maxims. The latest product of the press in this line is *Thoughts of the Servant of God Thérèse of*

the Child Jesus. It is a handsome little volume of 212 pages, and contains selections in brief paragraphs from the "Histoire d'une Ame", "Letters" and "Reminiscences" on the chief virtues and devout practices of the religious life. (P. J. Kenedy & Sons.)

The Paulist Press (New York) is issuing a number of timely pamphlets. One of these is a brief sketch of *St. Elizabeth of Hungary, Patroness of the Poor*, by Thomas B. Reilly. Another is *Martyrs according to Bernard Shaw*, by Fr. Daniel A. Lord, S.J. The writer exposes the weakness of the "fable play" *Androcles and the Lion*, in which the playwright attempts to make sport of the virtue of the early Christian martyrs.

The pulpit draws much less freely on the treasures of the Epistles than on those of the Gospels; one reason, perhaps the main, is that there exist but few preachable explanations of the Epistles, though they abound in striking and effective sermon material which should be minted into common currency. Hence, the Rev. Edmond Carroll catered to a real want when he published a series of practical homiletic sketches on the Epistles (*Sermon Plans on the Sunday Epistles*, by the Rev. Edmond Carroll, London, The Kingscote Press). These outlines are brief but comprehensive; they do not arbitrarily select some one idea contained in the Sunday Epistle, but utilize its whole contents after the excellent fashion of the great homiletic masters of the past. Though not by any means ready-made sermons, they furnish matter that can easily be mastered and shaped into the desired form.

"Simplicity and brevity are two rhetorical qualities which every clergyman having the pastoral care of souls might do well to cultivate. The average congregation composed of toiling masses cares little for profound theological pronouncements which it cannot understand. Besides, to deliver such sermons is like overloading a delicate stomach with heavy indigestible food fit for a plowman or a piano-mover." These sane thoughts are quoted from the short foreword which Bishop Dunne, of Peoria, prefixes to his recent translation of a collection of sermons from the Italian. The English title of the volume is *Homilies on all the Sunday Gospels of the Ecclesiastical Year*, by the Rev. Gaetano Finco (St. Louis, B. Herder). There are fifty-two sermons in the volume of 276 pages; therefore they possess the quality of "brevity". The other quality, "simplicity", reveals itself to a little reading. The latter quality does not mean that the sermons are gaunt or sketchy. They are direct, thoughtful, graphic, and suggestive. The translation is genuine English, not Italianese.

A series of articles on "Faith", by Fr. Girardey, C.SS.R., which appeared in the *Ligourian*, have been collected into a neatly printed pamphlet (St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder, pp. 95). It treats clearly and briefly of the Church, Faith, and the qualities thereof. A number of practical suggestions are added. Some of the latter are directed to non-Catholics, which fact makes the booklet serviceable in the case of inquirers, while the main contents are instructive reading for the Catholic laity.

The New Missal in English for Every Day of the Year, recently published by Benziger Brothers, has many excellencies which ought to commend the book to religious and the devout laity. In the first place, durably bound in leather, it is a neat as well as handy volume. It will slip easily into a man's coat-pocket, while a woman, unprovided with such receptacle of her own, will find it easy to carry to church. Secondly, the Missal is complete. There is the Mass pertinent to each day, ferial or festal, of the year, as well as the votive and other occasional Masses. Thirdly, it is arranged according to the most recent liturgical requirements. Fourthly, it combines through its appendix a devotional prayer book with the liturgical missal. All these conveniences have been made possible by using extremely thin paper (the book contains over 1200 pages). The print is sufficiently clear and quite legible and there is rela-

tively little obtrusion of the lines on the reverse of the page. Lastly, but not leastly, the price of the book is comparatively small for so much intrinsic value.

People who want to be rightly informed on the *Roman Index of Forbidden Books* will find in the small volume by Father Betten, S.J., just what they are looking for. The fourth, enlarged, edition has recently been published by Herder (St. Louis). Besides answering all the puzzling questions pertaining to the subject, the book contains a considerable list of the works proscribed.

The *Manual of Apologetics* noticed elsewhere in the present number is based on the broad lines of traditional theology—lines that are of course fundamental to any systematic presentation of the preambles to faith. Attention might here be directed to a recent work in French that illustrates the apt use of a method or rather an argument which, if not wholly original—full originality in such matters is hardly possible, even were it desirable—is at least forceful and interesting.

The book is entitled *La Psychologie de la Conversion* and contains the lectures delivered by the author, P. Mainage, O.P., at the Catholic Institute in Paris during 1914. The phenomenon of conversion to Catholicism from every form of belief and cult is one that must arrest the attention of every thoughtful observer. The thousands who every year knock at the door of the Church are amongst the best types of manhood and womanhood, while those who abandon their Father's house are on the whole precisely of the opposite character. How is the influx to be explained? The literature in which this question is answered —books and papers on conversion—is extensive enough to fill a library. Works such as Brownson's *Convert*, Burnett's *Path*, Von Ruville's *Back to Mother Church*, abound, while collections of letters such as are gathered together in *Roads to Rome* and *Beyond the Roads to Rome* record the motives and religious experiences of countless eminent men and women who have found peace and plenty in the household of truth.

Few if any books are more interesting and instructive than these records of struggle and prayer, of pain and joy—autobiographies of the soul, than which nothing created is greater. But to reduce this mass of religious experience to some system and to educe therefrom the basal principles and to show that the manifold motives of conversion are rationally inexplicable, save by reduction on the one hand to God's illumination and urgency and on the other to the objective truth of Catholicism, requires long study, much research and collation, a thorough sifting of evidence, and a steady insight into the efficiency of psychical causes and influences. All these qualities are reflected in the work above mentioned. There is probably no other book which does just this thing, namely, prove inductively from the data of experience, not the necessity of the supernatural, of grace and faith and Church (for that were a contradiction in terms), but the necessity of appeal to a transcendent agency to explain certain phenomena of religious experience.

Besides unfolding this apologetic argument, the book contains a short but penetrating study of the late Professor James's chapter on the subconscious causes of conversion in his well-known work on religious experience. The volume is well equipped with table of contents, index, and bibliography (Beauchesne, Paris).

If evidences of sincerity and candor, together with a pleasing, open manner of writing, could commend a book as furnishing an answer worth pondering to the important question *What is a Christian?* then would the volume bearing the title here italicized be worthy of strong commendation. Unfortunately, these amiable qualities are counterbalanced by so partial a view of Christianity that it is impossible to regard the book as anything more than another contribution to the contradictory solutions of the problem that have been offered

by the "two or three hundred Christian sects, each claiming to have the correct interpretation of the Scriptures" (p. 176). Not so much by a study of the "Scriptures" as by an application of a concept which he himself has ideally constructed, Mr. Powell sets forth what appear to him to be some of the essential properties of Christianity. The "essence of the Christian philosophy comprises," he says, "four elements . . . the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, the Mastership of Jesus Christ, and the Immortal Destiny of the Human Soul" (p. 5). If now we ask: "Who is Jesus Christ? Is He very God as well as very man?" we are told that "Christianity does not stand or fall with any particular attempt to understand or interpret the person of Christ" (p. 13). And so far as we can infer from the somewhat indefinite context, Christ "reveals God", but we find no explicit recognition that Christ was and is truly and really *one with the Father*, as He declared Himself to be.

The personal divinity of Christ being thus ignored, if not denied, one need not be surprised to read that His Church "is not the Catholic nor the Lutheran nor the English Church; not the Presbyterian, nor the Congregational, nor the Methodist. It is all of these and it is more than all; for it is the ever-growing vision of the Christian ideal; forever purifying itself; forever embodying itself in the institutional life of the world under forms which vary from age to age, which are confessedly imperfect and subject to all the limitations of the flesh, but which none the less are worthy of the deepest reverence and most earnest devotion of the lover of his kind, because when all is said they are attempts to express the loftiest visions and the worthiest ambitions of which humanity is capable." And this we must suppose is Mr. Powell's church, which is located in Minneapolis.

One of the recent issues of the Columbia University *Studies* (No. 160) is entitled *The Boxer Rebellion in China*. It is apparently thorough, as it is a well documented and an interesting monograph on that sudden outbreak of the slumbering wrath of a stolid mass of humanity "which shook China out of the sleep of centuries, revolutionized the history and politics of a race possessing great inherent possibilities, and formed the background, the cause in fact, of momentous events which are taking place in the Far East to-day and the ultimate trend of which it is impossible to foretell". Many of the causes and some of the effects are described by the author of the volume, Paul H. Clemens, Ph.D. Among the causes Dr. Clemens finds the "political ostentation" (p. 73) of the Catholic clergy and the maladroitness of the Protestant. Be this as it may, the further allusions to the "fault of Christianity" in general missionary activity, allusions in which he manifests no little confusion of ideas, made hot by misplaced spleen, might better have been omitted. (Longmans, Green & Co., New York.)

It is natural of course that both sides in the present European war should make incessant use of the press in order to propagate throughout the world the justification of their respective positions. The French seem to be particularly active in this respect. An unceasing stream of pamphlets is flooding the public. Some of these are noticed among the Book Reviews in this number. Translations of others are appearing in English under the general title *Studies and Documents of the War*. Three of these issues have been sent to us: 1. *Who wanted War*, by E. Durkheim and E. Denis, Professors at the University of Paris; 2. *German Atrocities from German Evidence*, by Joseph Bédier, Professor at the Collège de France; 3. *How Germany seeks to justify her Atrocities*, by Joseph Bédier. (Paris, Librairie Armand Colin.) The titles themselves indicate sufficiently the standpoint of the respective authors. The documents have found competent translators. Whatever the judgment of the reader —the tribunal to which we must leave the evaluating of the evidence—there can be little doubt that we have here materials with which the future historian will have to reckon.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. Its Foundation and Constitution. By Father Peter Finlay, S.J. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1915. Pp. xii-264. Price, $1.00 *net.*

THOUGHTS OF THE SERVANT OF GOD, THÉRÈSE OF THE CHILD JESUS. The Little Flower of Jesus, Carmelite of the Monastery of Lisieux, 1873-1897. Translated from the French *Pensées* by an Irish Carmelite. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1915. Pp. 212. Price, $0.60; $0.66 *postpaid.*

A MANUAL OF APOLOGETICS. By the Rev. F. J. Koch. Translated from the revised German edition by A. M. Buchanan, M.A. (London). Revised and edited by the Rev. Charles Bruehl, D.D., Professor at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa. Joseph F. Wagner, New York. 1915. Pp. viii-212. Price, $0.75 *net.*

THE SHEPHERD OF MY SOUL. By the Rev. Charles J. Callan, of the Order of Preachers. John Murphy Co., Baltimore. 1915. Pp. 216.

DIEU: SON EXISTENCE ET SA NATURE. Solution Thomiste des Antinomies Agnostiques. Par P. Fr. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., Professeur de Théologie au Collège Angélique, Rome. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1915. Pp. 910. Prix, 10 *fr.*

NOS SAINTS DE PARIS. Par Dom du Bourg, Prieur de Sainte-Marie. Perrin & Cie., Paris. 1916. Pp. 320. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50.

FORCE ET LUMIÈRE POUR LE TEMPS DE L'ÉPREUVE. Par M. l'Abbé Émile Favier, Docteur en Théologie. Tous droits réservés. Deuxième édition. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. 159. Prix, 1 *fr.* 50.

THE NEW MISSAL IN ENGLISH. For Every Day in the Year. According to the Latest Decrees. With Introduction, Notes, and a Book of Prayer. By the Rev. F. X. Lasance, author of *My Prayer-Book.* Benziger Bros., New York. 1915. Pp. 1250. Prices, $1.50 to $3.25, according to binding.

HOMILIES ON ALL THE SUNDAY GOSPELS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. By the Rev. Gaetano Finco. Translated from the Italian by Edmund M. Dunne, D.D., Bishop of Peoria. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 276. Price, $1.00.

IS SCHISM LAWFUL? A Study in Primitive Ecclesiology with Special Reference to the Question of Schism. By the Rev. Edward Maguire, Maynooth College. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 323. Price, $1.80.

THE ROMAN INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS. Briefly explained for Catholic Booklovers and Students. By Francis S. Betten, S.J. Fourth edition enlarged. B. Herder, St. Louis. Pp. 73. Price, $0.35.

THE CATHOLIC FAITH. By the Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.SS.R. B. Herder, St. Louis. Pp. 94. Price, $0.15.

STANDARD BEARERS OF THE FAITH. By F. A. Forbes. Illustrated by Frank Ross Maguire. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 125. Price, $0.30.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

CLASSIFICATION OF DESIRES IN ST. THOMAS AND IN MODERN SOCIOLOGY. Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Philosophy of the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By Henry Ignatius Smith, O.P. National Capital Press, Inc., Washington, D. C. 1915. Pp. 59.

A STUDY IN SOCIALISM. By Benedict Elder. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 328. Price, $1.00.

NOS DEUX PATRIES: LA FRANCE ET L'ÉGLISE. Par M. l'Abbé Arnaud d'Angel, Docteur en Théologie et en Philosophie, Aumonier du Lycée de Marseille et de l'Association des Dames Françaises (Croix-Rouge—Comité de Marseille). P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. 163. Prix, 1 *fr.* 50; 1 *fr.* 70 *franco.*

LA PATRIE. Conférences, Discours et Allocutions. Prononcés les 29 Mars, 25 Avril, 20 Juin, 29 Septembre, 15 Novembre 1914—14 Mars 1915. Par le R. P. Marie-Albert Janvier, des Frères Prêcheurs. Deuxième édition. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. 119. Prix, 1 *fr.*; 1 *fr.* 10 *franco.*

NOTRE PATRIOTISME, CE QU'IL DOIT ETRE? Par le Comte de Chabrol. Avant-propos par Georges Goyau. (*Loin du Front, 1914-1915.*) Troisième édition. P. Lethielleux, Paris. Pp. 113. Prix, 0 *fr.* 75 *franco.*

HISTORICAL.

THE SEQUEL TO CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION. The Story of the English Catholics continued down to the Re-establishment of Their Hierarchy in 1850. By the Right Rev. Monsignor Bernard Ward, F. R. Hist. S., Corresponding Member of the Société Archéologique de France, President of St. Edmund's College, author of *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England* (*1781-1803*) and *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation* (*1803-1829*). In two volumes. Vol. I: 1830-1840. Vol. II: 1840-1850. With illustrations. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1915. Pp. xx-296 and viii-328. Price, $6.00 *net.*

A SHORT HISTORY OF GERMANY. From the Earliest Times to the Year 1913. By Francis M. Schirp, Ph.D., Regis High School, New York. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1915. Pp. 264. Price, $1.00.

THE BOXER REBELLION. A Political and Diplomatic Review. By Paul H. Clements, Ph.D., sometime Fellow of International Law, Columbia University, etc. (*Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University. Vol. LXVI, No. 3.) Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1915. Pp. 233. Price, $2.00.

RUSSIAN SOCIOLOGY. A Contribution to the History of Sociological Thought and Theory. By Julius F. Hecker, Ph.D. (*Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University. Vol. LXVII, No. 1.) Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1915. Pp. 309. Price, $2.50.

THE ETHIOPIC LITURGY. Its Sources, Development, and Present Form. By the Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D. (Munich), Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago. (*The Hale Lectures, 1914-1915.*) The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee; A. R. Mowbray & Co., London. 1915. Pp. xvi-487. Price, $1.50; $1.65 *postpaid.*

LE PAPE ET LA GUERRE. Par Paul Dudon. Édition de propagande. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. 57. Prix, 0 *fr.* 50; 0 *fr.* 55 *franco.*

LA GUERRE: QUI L'A VOULUE? D'après les documents diplomatiques. Par Paul Dudon. Édition de propagande. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. 61. Prix, 0 *fr.* 50; 0 *fr.* 55 *franco.*

DIE ORGANISATION DER MILITÄRSEELSORGE IN EINER HEIMATGARNISON. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des religiösen Lebens unseres Heeres im Kriegsjahr 1914-15. Von Oberlehrer Heinr. Jos. Radermacher, z. Zt. Garnisonpfarrer der Festung Cöln. Volksvereins-Verlag GmbH., M. Gladbach. 1915. Seiten 64. Preis, 1 *M.* 20.

ALSACE, LORRAINE ET FRANCE RHÉNANE. Exposé des droits historiques de la France sur toute le rive gauche du Rhin. Par Stéphen Coubé. Avec Préface de M. Maurice Barrès. Dédié aux négociateurs de la paix victorieuse. Deuxième édition. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1915. Pp. xii-181. Prix, 2 *fr.*; 2 *fr.* 15 *franco.*